

JUN 23 1980

# Christian Order



## Summary of Contents for May, 1980

A CAUTIOUS LOOK AT THE  
CHARISMATIC MOVEMENT

*William A. Marra*

FAMILY AND RESPONSIBLE  
PARENTHOOD

*Kenya Bishops*

ELUCIDATIONS OR ILLUSIONS ?

*J. P. M. v.d. Ploeg, O.P.*

PARABLE OF A LOST SHEEP

*Rev. J. Lappin*

DO NOT PASS BY

*Philip Vickers*

CLAYTON HOUSE: 1 THE NEED FOR  
DEDICATION

*The Editor*

## PLEASE NOTE

*Christian Order* is not published in July and August. The June/July number will appear in the first week of June and the August/September number in the first week of September.

Will readers whose subscriptions are still due please be so kind as to renew without delay. Your prompt response to this request will be of the greatest help to us. We thank the very many who have renewed so promptly and so generously.

*Cum Permissu Superiorum*

## Contents

### Page

258 BESIDE THE POINT *The Editor*

260 DO NOT PASS BY *Philip Vickers*

266 ELUCIDATIONS OR  
ILLUSIONS?  
*J. P. M. v.d. Ploeg, O.P.*

279 A CAUTIOUS LOOK AT  
THE CHARISMATIC  
MOVEMENT *William A. Marra*

294 PARABLE OF A LOST  
SHEEP *Rev. J. Lappin*

296 CLAVER HOUSE: 1 *The Editor*

306 FAMILY AND RESPONSIBLE  
PARENTHOOD *Kenya Bishops*

318 BOOK REVIEWS *Paul Crane, S.J.*

### If You Change Your Address :

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

*Christian Order* is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

*Christian Order* is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

### Air-mail rates as follows :

U.S.A., Canada  
India, etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00  
Australia—£4.50, A. \$8.00  
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

# Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

---

VOLUME 21

MAY

NUMBER 5

---

## Beside the Point

THE EDITOR

I WISH it well. I am without any desire at all to be cynical, but, quite honestly, I cannot see the point—still less, any future—to it. I refer, of course, to the National Pastoral Congress, which is upon us. Already, in the pages of *Christian Order*, I have given my reasons for considering it an expensive exercise in futility and little more. In the first place, the technical difficulties seem to me to be insuperable. I cannot for the life of me see how, with all the good will in the world, two thousand people—however split up and subdivided—can arrive at any significant conclusions with regard to seven or eight topics of considerable depth and complexity in a matter of three days. I simply cannot see it; nor do I believe that anyone else can. I can see how two thousand people can be manipulated *en masse* or in groups by a skilled few to produce a bogus consensus round certain points; but I would hope that this kind of gerrymandering would be ruled out as unworthy at the Liverpool Congress, though it was practised in what one is forced to describe as the crooked Congress that was convened at Detroit in the United States a few years back. The performance there was disgusting. I feel sure there will be none of it at Liverpool. Goodwill and friendliness will be there in plenty. But to what end? What is the idea?

My second reason for describing the forthcoming Congress in the somewhat severe terms already employed is

that it is bound of its very nature to be unrepresentative of the rank-and-file of the Church in this country. A reasonable parallel may be drawn with the Political Party Conferences that are held each year. On these occasions, the delegates who attend are drawn from those whose lives are largely taken up with party politics. It is in the very nature of the case that this should be so; but what this means, in fact, is that they are unrepresentative, on the whole, of the party rank-and-file, which does not share their interest in party politics to anything like the same degree. As I see it, the same will tend to be the case with the forthcoming National Pastoral Congress. It is to be expected that you will get in attendance those whose lives are more than usually taken up with post-conciliar church affairs. This would appear to indicate that those of progressive bent—I do not use the word pejoratively—will tend to predominate; traditionalists, by definition, having tended to retire from active participation in present-day happenings within the Church or to have been excluded from them. I write this in no spirit of malice at all, but because it seems to me to be in the very nature of things that this is what we shall find at the Congress. The prevailing wind there will be one of progressive change. I regard this as unfortunate because I believe that rank-and-file opinion throughout the Church today would like to call a halt, at least for the time being, to a great deal of what is being carried through nowadays in what is called “the spirit of Vatican II”. Having had fifteen years of it, the time would seem to have come for a period of measured and prayerful reflection on the course of post-conciliar events, followed by a process of balanced and quiet consolidation. The prayer of so many now is for peace within the Church—of the sort that comes when the truth enclosed within her heart is possessed lovingly by all her members, who are united in its possession and seen to be thus united.

This is our need at present—tha quiet possession of truth in love. With the best will in the world I do not see the forthcoming Congress as possessed of the capacity to give this to us. I am forced in consequence—in no spirit of hostility; in fact, in sadness—to regard its proceedings as irrelevant, beside the point.

This article by the Director in this country of Aid to the Church in Need tells how the Persecuted Church has suffered everywhere during the past two years. We have the highest regard for this work and for its founder, Father Werenfried van Straaten. Readers who would like to help it financially should send their contributions to the Author of this article at 3 - 5, North St., Chichester, W. Sussex PO19 1LB.

## Do Not Pass By

### RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION AND BRITAIN'S RESPONSE

PHILIP VICKERS

THREE years ago Fr. Paul Crane kindly invited me to contribute an article on the persecuted Church and the work of Aid to the Church in Need. ("Who Speaks for the Persecuted Church?", *Christian Order*, March 1977). That article was later reproduced as a pamphlet and is still doing the rounds. At that time I had been Director of ACN in Britain for about a year. How then have the years 1978 and 1979 fared in so far as our work is concerned and how has the fate of the Church persecuted changed?

#### *Positive Developments*

One can immediately answer with a number of positive developments. There is certainly a much wider consciousness throughout the Church in Britain of the fate of the persecuted (lay people, parish priests, religious and the hierarchy) and a consciousness which results in positive action. This has been achieved, for ACN, by a policy of "multiple options": we have taken every opportunity to present the case and to appeal for support. Whenever possible all aspects of the media: press, television and radio; innumerable parish pulpits; pilgrimages and night vigils; book and tape publishing; school talks; conferences; press services; direct mail: everything has made its contribution. Had we not enjoyed, as we increasingly do, the support of many parish priests, we could never have made

the field of action with which it is concerned. Within the the impact from the pulpit that our Sunday Mass appeals have achieved. When I wrote my first *Christian Order* article I knew that less than 5% of Catholic priests could ever have had the opportunity of hearing of ACN. Today, over 10% are active benefactors.

As a result donations have risen by a multiplying factor of five over the year; so that 1979 recorded nearly £4m from a comparative handful of benefactors representing less than half of one per cent of the practising Catholic population of the country. During this period of growth in Britain, ACN's offices in thirteen countries recorded a massive increase of 43%; so that 1978's total amounted to nearly £19m.

One of the encouraging factors in this growth has been, of course, the election of a Polish Pope with his real experience of communist oppression of the Church. As Cardinal Woytlyla, he was our main channel of communication and aid with the Polish hierarchy and a great personal friend of Fr. Werenfried van Straaten the famous "Bacon Priest", founder and now Moderator General of Aid to the Church in Need. Certainly these two men have a lot in common: one obvious characteristic is their real humanity and straightforward intellectuality of thought and action allied with deep love and compassion. The firm and unwavering leadership of such men is something increasingly sought after, as we know from the very considerable post bag we receive from our supporters. Fr. Werenfried's leadership of ACN continues unabated, but he is now reinforced by a hard working Council and by an executive committee made up of a surprisingly young group of co-workers, including the National Directors of some of the major countries in the work. In this way continuity of effort is being built in and it is re-inforced by the annual international meetings which are held in Königstein in West Germany. Each year a theme is taken: last year it was "Young Churches in Africa" and was addressed by Fr. Victor Mertens, S.J., the Jesuit General's then Assistant for Africa; the year before it was Latin America; and this year it is the persecuted Church in communist lands. The papers coming from these conferences are of vital importance in ensuring that ACN is as up-to-date as can be in

UK the National Conference "Communism and Christianity Today and Tomorrow" (held at Upholland in October 1978) was a significant development: the first conference on such a theme to be held in the UK. It concerned itself with the plight of the Church in Russia, Eastern Europe and China and with the underlying trends of Marxism and liberal capitalism in the West.

### *The Persecution Grows*

What then of the fate of the persecuted in such countries today? The news is not good. In Russia Fr. Dudko has been re-arrested yet again, as have Fr. Gleb Yakunin and Lev Regelson. Far worse than this, the terrible murders have increased: Fr. Ivasyuk, tortured to death in Turkmenia in December 1978; Fr. Milan Gono, a priest secretly ordained by the late Cardinal Trochta in Czechoslovakia, who died of violence in Bratislava prison on the 20th or 21st of July, 1979. The anticipated Soviet crack-down has occurred. In 1978 we issued a pamphlet entitled "The Sad and the Beautiful — Refugee problems in Indo-China" based on a visit by ACN personnel to the refugee camps in Thailand and appealing for a specific £60,000 ACN aid programme. It met with little response. Nevertheless, it accurately reported the situation in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. The recent world-wide spotlight focussed on starvation in Kampuchea has elicited millions of pounds worth of aid, much of it never to reach its donors' intended destinations, if the reports of the International Red Cross, UNICEF, OXFAM and the B.B.C.'s "Panorama" reporter are to be believed. This was, sadly, as we anticipated and we have remained totally incapable of assisting *within* Kampuchea, if only because the Church we are to aid has virtually ceased to exist. (There were only some 20,000 Catholics, 5,000 Protestants in the original 7m population which has now been reduced to an estimated 3-4m: since they were amongst the primary targets for liquidation in the "total social revolution" it is unlikely that more than a secret handful remain alive today). If, as Catholics, we are supposed to be somewhat more enlightened than some of our more blinded brethren it is a sadness that we could not react to the desperate need there three and a half years ago. Nevertheless, a growing concern with the ultimate purposes of some charities, which are appealing for sup-

port, and a growing desire on the part of many Catholics to support the vertical dimension as much as the horizontal one is certainly another reason for the growth of ACN in Britain.

In turning our attention to the outright persecution of Christians in Lebanon—an affair as little publicised in the West as the aftermath in Kampuchea is widely publicised—(one may wonder why) we have again attempted to bring to Catholic awareness the tragic plight of their fellow believers who are under attack by the PLO and units of the Syrian Army. That this war is being waged within 150 miles of Bethlehem itself; that, like the Civil War in Spain, it is being used as a testbed for terrible new Russian weapons of destruction (phosphorus shells which cause uncontrollable fires); and that the attack on Christians there has been described as “oppression similar to that in communist countries” must surely give cause for grave concern? Yes, the Chapel of Perpetual Adoration at Tyburn was packed throughout the night for the All Night Vigil just before Christmas 1979 and persecution in Lebanon was one of the themes of the Vigil. This article itself brings the sufferings of Lebanese Christians at least to your attention and we are appealing for financial help, for your help. In 1978 we were making similar appeals to support the victims of the Soviet based “Red Terror” in Ethiopia: we still need to help them, but we can do so only through your generosity. Three years ago we publicised the cynical construction of a special Olympics church in Moscow, designed as window dressing for the West and for immediate, post-Olympic conversion into a “Palace of Marriage”. Today the Moscow Olympics have become front page news over Afghanistan.

### *Everywhere the Church is in Need*

Everywhere the Church is in need! Everywhere it is the same people who are suffering: the poor, the innocent, the dispossessed, the illiterate, the children, the mothers. Everywhere the same exploiters of the “Left” and of the “Right” demand their pound of flesh. World-wide institutions and world-wide organisations confuse and mislead. The Church speaks up and acts on behalf of the exploited and everywhere the Church is attacked: in Latin America Fr. Werenfried is accused of being a Communist, because he

is on the side of the poor against the big landowners. In communist countries he is ridiculed as the last of the "Cold Warriors". In the West he is misjudged as "fervently anti-Communist" (*The Month* Feb. 1979; the *Catholic Herald* Feb. 9th, 1979). Yet Fr. Werenfried has written: "There are many honest Communists, whose good faith we do not doubt. There are others whom we admire for their great philanthropy or to whom we are grateful for their spirit of self-sacrifice that puts us all to shame . . . They are deserving of our love even though their dictatorship is a calamity from which we need deliverance as much as from plague, famine and war". But, ACN makes little appeal to those Catholics who believe that God's Church can live in peace with Communism. Asserting that Communism has lost its militant atheistic character they contest the right of existence of ACN, which disturbs their dialogue with the persecutors. This is an illusion, however. Communism, which the late Pope called "incurable", changes its tactics but never its Satanic purpose: the negation of God, His expulsion by force from the mind, heart and consciousness of the faithful and the destruction of all religion. Our work in Britain has certainly not escaped the slings and arrows of similarly disturbed members of the Church very largely, I still believe, because our critics have no first-hand knowledge or appreciation of what ACN really is and are put off by second-hand complaints and unjustified criticisms.

### *The Man and his Work*

Many articles have been published all over the world about the work of ACN and not a few have mentined the "mystery" of the work, how it was that a religious of poor health should have been entrusted with such an enterprise, jeopardised by his own natural rashness, for Fr. Werenfried is "all heart", as has been said before. Those of us who are privileged to know him personally can completely echo this description by his own niece, Antonia Willemsen, who is General Secretary of the work: "his unshakable trust in God, his childlike devotion to Mary, his manly loyalty to the faith, his uncompromising stand for the truth, his deep respect for all who suffer and his consequent abhorrence of beauraucratic charity, his qualities as a manager, his

readiness to delegate responsibility and the Christian humour with which he bears difficulties, troublesome people and himself". Fr. Werenfried has taught all his collaborators and benefactors that *the Gospel is true*: you only have to try it for yourself! Total trust in God, he says, is rewarded by total support by God. God cannot share our confidence with anyone else, let alone with anything else. On occasions beyond number the most impossible situations have been reversed by God: the building of over 3,000 churches behind the Iron Curtain; the return of professed atheists, members of the Communist Party, to the Faith. Today there are literally millions of people inside and outside the Church who are dependent upon the support of Aid to the Church in Need, often indeed without their ever knowing it. It plays a truly vital role in the life of the Church: in the mission fields of the Third World; in the refugee camps and diaspora of the émigrés; in the prisons and forced labour camps of the communist bloc; in the seminaries and training colleges; in the pro-life battle in the West; in the hearts and minds of over 600,000 of its benefactors who must practice the way of the Cross in their daily lives. In this work no personality may take precedence over the needs of the poor and the persecuted, those of whom Jesus spoke in the Sermon on the Mount and who are the élite of the Church. Whatever our shortcomings we must overcome self and recognise in the suffering Church the image of Christ living with us in our contemporary world.

### *A Heavy Responsibility*

We bear a heavy responsibility, says Fr. Werenfried, for it may depend on how you—rich young man!—respond to God's grace, whether the name of Christ is blessed or cursed. We can be a way to Him or a barrier. There is nothing worse than to shirk the task of helping Jesus who is suffering in His Church, nothing more precious than to comfort Him forsaken in His suffering brothers. George Orwell's *1984* now seems quite near. 1984 is also the Communist Party's deadline for the elimination of religion. The 1980's have been designated as the years of "articulated stress". In this eleventh hour of the Church we must remain sure in our certain knowledge that Christ has overcome the world and that God alone can and will save us.

We are privileged this month to publish yet another article from the pen of one of Europe's most distinguished theologians, Father J. M. v.d. Ploeg, O.P., Emeritus Professor of the University of Nijmegen. In what follows, he offers a penetrating and scholarly critique of the Joint Commission's pamphlet, *Elucidations*, which was published in the early part of last year, in reply to criticisms of the Joint Commission's Agreed Statements on the Eucharist and Holy Orders.

## Elucidations or Illusions ?

· PROF. DR. J. P. M. v.d. PLOEG, O.P.

IN the beginning of 1979, the Anglican - Roman Catholic Commission of theologians, which had produced the now well-known Agreed Statements on *Eucharistic Doctrine* (Windsor, 1971), *Ministry and Ordination* (Canterbury, 1973) and *Authority in the Church* (Venice, 1976), published a small pamphlet of twelve pages entitled *Elucidations*. It concerned some points raised in connection with the first two documents listed above. We have before us a copy of the pamphlet, published by the SPCK and the Catholic Truth Society under the copyright of Bishops McAdoo (Anglican, Dublin) and Clark (Catholic, East Anglica).

The Joint (Anglican-Roman Catholic) Commission had asked for criticism concerning its published Statements and criticism came in from the Catholic as well as the Protestant side. No names are mentioned in *Elucidations*, which is in comment on the criticism that was received. The Commission appears to have no intention of entering into further discussion.

### *Ambiguity of Various Pronouncements*

The principal criticism concerned the ambiguity of the

various pronouncements in the first two Statements, as well as the fact that nowhere is the well-known doctrine of the Catholic Church — as formulated, for example, by the Council of Trent—clearly expressed. One may admit that certain formulae, used normally in the exposition of Catholic doctrine, would be liable to remind the Anglican members of the Commission of the years of doctrinal struggle against them. If the lack of clear expression of Catholic doctrine is due to this reason, one could understand it as a praiseworthy act of courtesy. The question is different, however, if (as we believe) the clear formulation of Catholic doctrine was avoided by Catholic members of the Joint Commission because of their knowledge that the Anglican members could not agree with its content. This is particularly true where the pronouncements of the Council of Trent are concerned, for that Council formulated Catholic truth in an exemplary and concise manner. It is difficult to find Catholic doctrine better formulated than in the dogmatic canons of Trent: so much so, that it is difficult or, indeed, impossible for anyone refusing to use them to keep the Catholic faith. This, apart from the fact that every Catholic is bound to subscribe to them, so that anyone refusing explicitly to do so cannot be called a true Roman Catholic.

### *Ambiguity not Elucidated*

The ambiguity of the Windsor and Canterbury Agreed Statements is not elucidated by the *Elucidations* of the Joint Commission, for these are of an elusive character and I fear they will not satisfy serious critics. Again, we find in this pamphlet no clear and unambiguous statement of Catholic doctrine, of the sort that would satisfy everybody and remove doubts from anyone of good will.

Let me give an example. The doctrine of the *opus operatum* of the Sacraments is nowhere affirmed: where a Catholic would expect its affirmation, he finds something different. For example, in No. 13 one reads:

“Both traditions agree that a sacramental rite is a visible sign *through which* (our emphasis) the grace of God is given by the Holy Spirit in the Church”.

The ambiguity of this statement lies in the words “through

which" (not *by* which), because of the various ways a Sacrament is thought to give grace; as *opus operatum*—by its own virtue; or as *opus operantis* (by virtue of him who receives the Sacrament). This latter is Protestant doctrine. Canon 6 of the Council of Trent, "On the Sacraments" states:

"If anyone says that the Sacraments of the New Law do not contain the grace which they signify—let him be *anathema*".

And Canon 8:

"If anyone says that the Sacraments of the New Law do not administer grace themselves *ex opere operato*; but that faith in the divine promise alone is sufficient to obtain grace—let him be *anathema*". (Denziger -S 1606, 1608).

One looks in vain for this clear statement of doctrine in the two Agreed Statements on *Eucharistic Doctrine* and *Ministry and Ordination*, or in the elucidations. No even their equivalent in other words is to be found.

That the words "a visible sign through which the grace of God is given" are ambiguous is clear already from the fact that this formula was agreed to by those Anglican members of the Joint Commission who repudiated the Catholic doctrine of the *opus operatum*, which was, of course, held in abhorrence by the sixteenth-century reformers. The same conclusion emerges from the fact that in *Elucidations* a distinction is made between *through* (the Sacraments) and *by* (the Holy Spirit): the words have been carefully chosen. The conclusion emerges again in No. 13:

"Those who are ordained by prayer and the laying on of hands receive their ministry from Christ through those designated in the Church to hand it on; together with the office they are given the grace needed for its fulfilment . . . Since New Testament times the Church has required such recognition and authorization for those who are to exercise the principal functions of *episcopate* in the name of Christ. This is what both traditions mean by the sacramental rite of ordination".

Again, these words have been chosen most carefully, if we except the last sentence, which is simply not true. Nowhere in this description is there any mention of grace *given by*

the *Sacrament of Orders* and the "ministry" is equated with authority: bishops (or priests) are "designated" for their office; "together" with this designation they receive grace. The Church "recognises them" and "gives them authority" to exercise their functions in the name of Christ. Through the use of these words the true Catholic doctrine is carefully avoided. What is said is not untrue; but, from the Catholic standpoint, it is essentially incomplete. It becomes untrue because it purports to give the "substantial" doctrine of the Church in this matter: "This is what both traditions mean by the sacramental rite of ordination". We ask the Catholic members of the Commission to read the doctrinal formulations of the Council of Trent. True, this Council was called as a bulwark against the Reformation of the sixteenth-century; it is one of the major obstacles blocking the way to modern ecumenism. We know that not a few "Catholic" ecumenists would like to break it down; but we are not disposed to assist them in their work of demolishing the Catholic Church.

#### *"Elucidations" and the Eucharist*

In its answer in *Elucidations* to comments and criticisms received concerning the Windsor Statement on *Eucharistic Doctrine* the Joint Commission insists very much on the meanings it attributes to the Greek word *anámnesis* (commemoration, memorial, remembrance). With the *New English Bible* the words of 1 Cor. 11/24-25 are translated as "Do this as a memorial of me" whereas the *Revised Version* has, "Do this in remembrance of me". In the Latin of the *Vulgate* the same, "Hoc facite in meam commemorationem". In Syriac, "Hakanna hwattûn âbdîn idûkrony" i.e., "So you shall do in memory of me". We would not insist here on what might be considered an insignificant difference, if we did not get the impression from the whole text of *Elucidations* that the Mass itself is to be considered as a memorial and *no more than that*. In No. 5 it is said that the word *anámnesis* "seems to do full justice to the semitic background". The "sacramental reality, in which the once-for-all effect of salvation becomes effective in the present through the action of the Holy Spirit" is according to the Joint Commission, "well expressed by the word *anámnesis*" (No. 5). This would enable us "to affirm a

strong conviction of sacramental realism and to reject mere symbolism" (ib.). Between both quotations one finds the passage on the "semitic background".

This is not the place to give a full exposition of the meaning of the Aramaic and Syriac word *dûkrana* (*anámnesis*) and its equivalents in other semitic languages. Books have been written on this subject. For Westerners a clear understanding of a semitic word is often difficult if it has no clearly defined meaning, but, rather, a broad "field of meanings". For this reason one should avoid using the "semitic background" of *anámnesis* when trying to explain "sacramental realism". This is even unscientific, though employed often enough by clerics who have an insufficient understanding of Aramaic, resp. Syriac, or none at all. By people who do not think scientifically a *dûkrana* was (and sometimes is) thought of as having real effects (effecting in a certain way what it means), though it has not. But when a priest pronounces at the altar the eucharistic words of consecration, they *have* a real effect: they change bread and wine into the body and blood of Our Saviour. This we believe.

### *"Elucidations" and the Sacrifice of the Mass*

Now, when in the same No. 5 of *Elucidations* the Eucharist is called "a sacrifice in the sacramental sense" (p. 7, at the bottom), this is certainly true, but insufficiently expressive of the truth so long as we do not know which meaning *all* the members of the Joint Commission attach to the term "sacrament". For, on this subject, there is, as we have said, a fundamental difference between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Church. This is insinuated also by the words which follow the statement quoted above; "provided that it is clear that this is not repetition of the historical sacrifice". We all accept Hebrews 9, 12, 26, 28. There is one historical sacrifice which, *as historical*, is not to be repeated. But the Council of Trent teaches us also that the bloody immolation of Christ on Calvary becomes present in the unbloody immolation of the same Christ on our altars. This unbloody immolation (for the word, see Denziger-Sch. 1743) is a *real* and *propitiatory sacrifice* (Trent, Canons 1 and 3 on the Sacrifice of the Mass;

Denziger-Sch. 1751, 1753). This clearly formulated doctrine is conspicuous by its absence from both the Windsor Statement and *Elucidations*. This is easy to understand: if the Anglican members of the Joint Commission had subscribed to the dogma of Trent, they would have been already well on the way to becoming Catholics. And conversion to the Catholic Church was not within the stated scope of the Windsor, Canterbury and Venice meetings of the Joint Commission.

*Elucidations* says that the action of the *anámnesis* "is itself the *fruit* (our emphasis) of the sacrifice". Again, the identification of the sacramental sacrifice with the one of Calvary is purposely avoided. Instead of saying "the action is the fruit of the sacrifice", a Catholic must say, "the action gives us the fruits of the sacrifice of Christ" (applying them to us). This is Catholic doctrine not that of the Protestant members of the Joint Commission.

#### "*Elucidations*" and Transubstantiation

Some critics refused to admit that the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ, as the Windsor Statements says they do and is able so to say because it takes into account the various meanings that can be given to the word "becomes". In *Elucidations* (No. 6) we read, "His body and blood are given through the action of the Holy Spirit, *appropriating* (our emphasis) bread and wine so that they become the food of the new creation already inaugurated by the coming of Christ". This does not mean more than that the Holy Spirit takes possession in some way or other of the bread and wine, not that they cease to be bread and wine, having been substantially changed. We cannot expect more from a Commission with a number of Protestant members, but what it says in this context is clearly not the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church. In order to clarify the meaning of "becoming" the Joint Commission adds that, in the context under consideration here, it does not "imply material change" (*ib.*); this is true only insofar as the change is *much more* than a common, ordinary "material change". The expression is apt to be misunderstood by Catholics not trained in the subtleties of ecumenical theology.

The text continues: "Nor does the liturgical use of the word imply that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in such a way that in the eucharistic celebration his presence is limited to the consecrated elements". This ingeniously formulated phrase may be understood in various ways. St. Thomas taught that Christ is not present in the Eucharist "as in a place", but "*per modum substantiae*" (Sum. Theol., 111, 76, 5); "in the manner of a substance". In this way it is clear that his presence is not "limited" to the consecrated elements. But in this way it is not understood by the Commission, because in *Elucidations* it says; "What is here affirmed is a *sacramental presence* (our emphasis)". But *this* presence is certainly "limited to the consecrated elements". And what is the meaning of "sacramental presence" if not that of some kind of vague "presence", which does not exclude the essentially contradictory opinions of the Church of Rome and that of Canterbury.

"In the sacramental order", the text continues, "the realities of faith become present in visible and tangible signs, enabling Christians to avail themselves of the fruits of the once-for-all redemption. In the eucharist the human person encounters in faith the person of Christ in his sacramental body and blood". This is the same evasive language that we have already encountered and which is characteristic of the three Agreed Statements and the pamphlet, *Elucidations*. The Eucharist, as a sacrament, belongs to the order of signs—yes; but it is much more than that. Just what it really is, *Elucidations* does not say.

In No. 7 (*Elucidations*) it is said that "Some traditions have placed a special *emphasis* (our ital.) on the *association* (our ital.) of Christ's presence with the consecrated elements; others have emphasized Christ's presence in the heart of the believer through reception by faith. In the opinion of the Joint Commission neither emphasis "is incompatible with eucharistic faith, provided that the complementary movement emphasized by the other position is not denied (ib.)". Here again, every notion of a substantial change of bread and wine (*conversio totalis*, cf. St. Thomas Aquinas) is purposely excluded from the language employed. Within and according to the Catholic Church there

is more than mere "emphasis" and certainly more than "association" alone.

### *Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament*

Nos. 8 - 9 of *Elucidations* treat of the Blessed Sacrament outside Holy Mass and its reservation for the sick. A Catholic kneels before the Blessed Sacrament and may even prostrate himself before it, *adoring* it. For this truth the holy martyrs of Gorcum in Holland, as well as others elsewhere, gave their lives. They were condemned to death by the Protestants, for whom such adoration was no more than "abominable idolatry", according to the Catechism of Heidelberg. Neither can it be denied that this is also the opinion of the true Protestant members of the Joint Commission; whereas Catholics cannot subscribe to it. But, how do you avoid Scylla and Charybdis in an "agreed statement?" In "later" times, *Elucidations* says, "there developed a tendency to stress the veneration of Christ's presence in the consecrated elements". We note the evasive words "veneration" and "presence". Catholics do not venerate, but adore; and the object of their adoration is not a vague "presence", but Christ Himself, substantially present. This we know.

In *Elucidations*, the use of the word "adoration" is not avoided entirely; but we are told that "in the celebration of the eucharist adoration is first and foremost offered to the Father" (No. 8), to whom is "the movement of all our adoration". Therefore, "The Christ whom we adore in the eucharist is Christ glorifying his Father". This is a curious pronouncement which will certainly be criticized by Protestants: for Catholics it is unacceptable. The verb "to glorify" (Greek—*doxázoo*) is a favourite expression of the Gospel of St. John, where we read that the son is glorified by the Father (8, 54, 17, 1, 5), in the father (14, 13.) with (*para*) the Father (17, 5), by the *paráklētos* (16, 14), in the apostles (17, 10): Jesus asks the Father to glorify the Son, in order that the Son may glorify Him (17, 1); Jesus glorified the Father on earth by accomplishing the works which the Father had given him to do (17, 4) and prayed; "Now glorify me with Thyself (in thine own presence) with the glory which I had with Thee before the

world was (17, 5)"; the Son of God is glorified by the glory of God, to be revealed by the resurrection of Lazarus (11, 4); when (or after) Jesus was glorified, the Spirit came down on the apostles (7, 39; 12, 15, 23). Nowhere else in the New Testament is it said that Jesus glorifies his Father or God; in the Gospels also men glorify God (Mt. 5, 16; 9, 8; 15, 31 : Mk. 2, 12; Luke 2, 20; 5, 25, 26; 7, 16; 13, 13; 17, 15; 18, 43; 23, 47; John 21, 19) or wish to be glorified (i.e. praised; Mt. 6, 2). In *Elucidations* "Christ glorifying his Father" can only mean, Christ in so far as he glorifies his Father. This is a restriction which cannot be made: the object of adoration is a (divine) person because of what he *is*, not because of what he *does*. The certainly unhappy phrase under consideration appears as an endeavour to restrict adoration to God the Father. In the words (of *Elucidations*) "The movement of all our adoration is to the Father, through, with, and in Christ, in the power of the Spirit". The term "all" is too much. In the Blessed Sacrament we adore the Son of God and with Him the whole Trinity.

The words which now follow are equally inexact: "The whole eucharistic action is a continuous movement in which Christ offers himself in his sacramental body and blood *to his people* (our emphasis) and in which they receive him in faith and thanksgiving". The Holy Mass is a true sacrifice offered *to God*, not to "his people"; this people receives Him not only in faith, but *in reality* (a sacramental one).

The "reservation" of the Eucharistic Sacrament outside Holy Mass is, according to *Elucidations*, "an extension of that celebration (p. 10)", "which remains the primary purpose of reservation (ib.)". Here the Roman Instruction, *Eucharisticum Mysterium* of 25/5/1967 is adduced in support, but wrongly: this would have been clear to everybody, if the text itself had been quoted (No. 49). This says that "the primary and original scope (*primarium ac primogenium finem*) of the reservation of the Blessed Sacrament in in church outside Holy Mass is the administration of Viaticum (the Eucharist given to the sick); the secondary purposes are Holy Communion outside Mass and the adoration of Jesus Christ" (N.B. not of the Father). The

Instruction goes on to quote *Mediator Dei* of Pope Pius XII (1947), which states that this reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for the sick "induced the laudable custom of adoring this heavenly food which is placed in the churches. This very cult of adoration is based on a valid and sound reason; above all because faith in the real presence of the Lord leads by its very nature (*connaturaliter*) to the exterior and public manifestation of the same faith". This is Catholic language and quite different from that which is employed in *Elucidations*. Historically, *reservation* came first, followed by adoration of the Blessed Sacrament outside the Mass; the latter is founded on the Real Presence, effectuated by the consecration during the Mass.

No. 9 of *Elucidations* remarks that, in spite of the "clarifications" given above, some still find "any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable". We understand this statement and appreciate its honesty because it is a logical consequence of the Protestant denial of Catholic eucharistic doctrine. In Catholic churches even the Cross is "adored" on Good Friday, as is well known; but this adoration is only relative, being related to Christ, the Son of God Himself. But the adoration of the Blessed Sacrament is different; its direct object is the divine Person of Our Lord Jesus Christ, united with his humanity.

### *Ministry and Ordination*

In Part II of *Elucidations* on *Ministry and Ordination* (the Canterbury Statement of 1973) some explanations are given of the meaning of this Agreed Statement. The sentence, "Both traditions agree that a sacramental rite is a visible sign *through* (itals. ours) which the grace of God is given by the Holy Spirit in the Church (No. 13)" is again ambiguous, because of the various meanings that may be attached to the word "through". A Catholic gives it a meaning different from that which a Protestant would give. Hence the words that follow and the description of the Sacrament of Holy Orders which they give, are also ambiguous. The text says that those who are ordained by prayer and the laying on of hands receive their ministry from Christ "through those designated in the Church to hand it on". Here the word "designated" is insufficient,

since its primary meaning is of a juridical act and we are not told that it has another meaning as well; the consecrating Bishop has not only to be *designated*, but also to be *ordained* (or *consecrated*) in the way the Catholic Church associates with and attaches to this word. That the comment we have just made is well founded and not unduly critical becomes clear from the following passage, containing a description of the Sacrament of Holy Orders and found in No. 13 of *Elucidations*: "Since New Testament times the Church has required such recognition and authorization for those who are to exercise the principal functions of *episcopo* in the name of Christ. This is what both traditions (Catholic and Anglican) mean by the sacramental rite of ordination". Here we do not only disagree, but protest. Ordination to the priesthood is not to be explained as an act of authority only or as one of "recognition" (of a grace already given). By his ordination the priest gets a real *power* "to offer and consecrate the true body and blood of the Lord, to forgive sins or not to forgive them" and his priesthood is not "only an office" (*officium tantum*), as Trent has made clear and declared (Denziger-S. 1771).

In No. 14 of *Elucidations* it is said that the "ordained ministry" "must be in continuity not only with the apostolic faith but also with the commission given to the apostles": this was recognised early in the Church. The word "commission" has of itself no more than a juridical meaning and is therefore—and at the very least—ambiguous.

### "*Elucidations*" and "*Apostolicae Curae*"

In No. 16, we read that the "substantial agreement" reached by the members of the Joint Commission on the nature of Ministry and Ordination "calls for a reappraisal of the verdict on Anglican Orders in *Apostolicae Curae* (1896)". This important papal document, the text of which was published in Michael Davies', *The Order of Melchisedech* (Augustine Publishing Co.; cf. pp. 158-172) ends with the following solemn declaration: "We decree that these letters and all things contained therein shall not be liable at any time to be impugned or objected to by reason of fault

or any other defect whatsoever of subreption or obreption of Our intentions, but are and shall always be valid and in force and shall be inviolably observed both juridically and otherwise, by all of whatsoever degree and pre-eminence, declaring null and void anything which, in these matters, may happen to be contrariwise attempted, whether wittingly or unwittingly, by any person whatsoever, by whatsoever authority or pretext, all things to the contrary notwithstanding . . . (No. 40)". This declaration of Leo XIII is in accordance with former declarations of the *Magisterium*. It has often been called infallible because of its extremely strong wording at the end. In spite of their extreme strength, the concluding words of this passage which has just been quoted do not completely fulfil the conditions for infallibility required by Vatican I (Denziger -S. 3074); the reason being that the invalidity of Anglican orders is a question of *fact*, not *directly* one "of faith and morals". Nevertheless, the fact in question is of the utmost importance and strongly *connected* with faith and morals. How can the Church assure its faithful of the valid reception of the sacraments, if it can err profoundly with regard to the validity of their administration? The *Magisterium* of the Bishop of Rome, *mater et magistra* of all the Churches; i.e. his *authority* to teach would be reduced to no more than the declaration of a personal opinion and the faithful liable, in consequence, to be easily fooled, were he not protected from this kind of error. Anyone, therefore, who, in denial of what has just been said, declares himself prepared to accept that Leo XIII could have erred in declaring Anglican Orders invalid in so solemn a fashion, lays himself open to the charge of believing that the solemn pronouncements of the Successors of St. Peter have no more value than the arguments that support them, so that, in consequence, all that they have said may be called into question at any time. Under such circumstances, there would be no *authority* to teach vested in the See of Peter, but, in the end, no more than the human wisdom (or lack of it) that the occupant of that See might possess at any moment of time.

### *Joint Statements Unacceptable*

Clearly, this issue raised by the Joint Commission is tremendous in its consequences. The desire for union with

the Anglicans has led its Catholic members to admit to a conclusion (viz., that the validity of Anglican Orders should be subject to reappraisal), liable to shake the very foundations of the Roman Catholic Church. We cannot admit to this conclusion; and we hope that its implications will lead the Catholic members of the Joint Commission eventually to a "reappraisal" of their own Joint Declarations. The fact that one of these Declarations could lead, indeed, to a call for such a reappraisal should have made the Catholic members of the Joint Commission much more cautious than they were and convinced them of the defective (to use no other word) character of their Agreed Statements and of their pamphlet, *Elucidations*, published early in 1979. The Statements are unacceptable for those Catholics who wish to remain faithful to the doctrine they have received from their Holy Mother the Catholic Church.

---

## THE CARDINAL'S DOG

"Cardinal Gray admits to being an animal lover who has had a successive string of dogs. He said that the dog before last had been quite a devout animal. 'She would always come to Mass with me, but when we changed to the English Mass after Vatican II, she took one look and ran', he said: 'She wouldn't go near a Mass again. She was very much a Tridentist' "—*Catholic Herald*, Feb. 29, 1980.

-----

Belonging to an Eminence gives one  
a sort of dignity;  
One knows what's what and what is not  
when following the Liturgy.  
So when they foisted on the Church  
illiterate Vernacular,  
My exit from the edifice was final and  
spectacular.

S. G.

What makes the Charismatic Movement unique is that the members assemble and pray in conscious expectation of an intense experience of God. Acknowledgements to the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*. Dr. William A. Marra is a professor of philosophy at Fordham University, New York. He lectures and writes extensively on ethical and religious topics.

# A Cautious Look at the Charismatic Movement

WILLIAM A. MARRA

MY first impression of a charismatic group was positive. Some fifteen young people, some with Bibles in their hands, were reading or talking quietly about religious matters. The minister introduced a black youth who proceeded to give testimony about the change that had occurred in his life ever since he entered the prayer group and experienced the effects of Jesus in his life. There were no traces of sullenness on his face, no signs of exaggeration or hysteria. He had gentle, pure eyes and his whole being seemed to radiate the serenity of one who had at last been touched by the true God.

Prior to that meeting I had heard most unfriendly reports about charismatic groups in general. I had heard about how wild they were and how dangerous to genuine orthodoxy. After seeing this group, however, and especially this black youth, I was tempted to say that we could use many more of these dangerous and wild enterprises.

I have had other positive contacts with the movement since then. A gifted member of my philosophical circle, a professor in a nominally Catholic university, seems to have made great progress in her own spiritual life. She has also had some good success in converting some of her students to a life of faith and prayer by having brought them into

her own charismatic prayer group. And from time to time as I travel around the country, I am touched by the faith and zeal of Catholics, some of whom confess to me that it is only due to their participating in charismatic prayer meetings that they are able to survive spiritually in the unequal contest that challenges the Catholics of today.

### *It may work in reverse*

Why have I stressed this positive side of my experience with the Charismatic Movement? For this reason: I have come to consider the movement as the single greatest danger now facing the Church. Despite its positive attractive side — perhaps *because* of this side — the Movement may well sweep away from the Church, and ultimately from Christ, those who have so far resisted the heresy, the schism and the blasphemy which have already claimed so many. The Devil, having failed to blow away the mantle of orthodoxy from these souls with the icy blasts of his secularistic and atheistic “interpretations” of Christianity, may now be employing the opposite tactic: beaming on them the warm, golden rays of an excellent counterfeit of faith enlivened by charity. This experience will seem so friendly that the deceived faithful may come to shed their mantle of orthodoxy gladly; for they will have been convinced that “creeds” and “cosmologies” serve no useful purpose and are actually divisive. Only love and joy and the sincere praise of God matter. What a victory this would be for the Deceiver!

I find three basic errors in the Movement which I entitle, respectively, the Error of the Eighth Sacrament, the Error of Archaism, and the Error of the Bodiless Spirit.

Before I briefly analyze these errors, let me first say exactly what I mean by the Charismatic Movement. The Movement is not correctly identified by the description that it comprises all those persons who regularly seek God through prayer. Do not all spiritual movements within the Church fulfil this test? Those who are members of the Sodality, or of Third Orders, or of the Legion of Mary, the Blue Army, and so on—all first of all believe in God and in Christ; all seek to lift prayers of praise, adoration, thanksgiving and petition to the heavenly throne. And

millions of individual faithful do likewise in prayerful faith. Are we now to say that the Charismatics have such a monopoly on prayer that their interest in this serves to identify the Movement? Hardly.

### *They 'expect' God*

What does make the Charismatic Movement unique, what clearly identifies it as a distinct entity is this qualification: the members always assemble and pray in *conscious expectation of a deep religious experience*—nothing less than the experience of God. Deprive the groups of this expectation, restrict their meetings to Bible study and common prayer with neither the hope nor the expectation of a religious experience, and you have, not the dynamic Charismatic Movement which adds hundreds of thousands to its rolls each year, but the ordinary Church group — the Sodality, the Third Order, etc. This point is of the utmost importance. For the Charismatic leaders protest that prayer and faith as such are really the only essential interests of the group, and that strictly secondary are the extraordinary manifestations: the tongues, the healings, the being slain in the spirit. These are alleged to be neither sought nor rejected. But I repeat my point: a Movement stripped of the expectation of religious experience, a Movement which really proclaimed an interest only in prayer and study would be lucky to attract even three thousand persons to its national congresses. How many sodality meetings have you attended which can fill a huge stadium? How many Third Order tours to the Holy Land do you know which can sign up ten thousand pilgrims? The Charismatics can fill stadiums as easily as the Green Bay Packers. Why? *They can promise action.*

### *The Eighth Sacrament*

Enemies have often accused the Church of relying on "magic". They profess to find too much "hocus-pocus" in Roman Catholic Sacraments. They would prefer a pure Christianity, a sober religion of prayer and good works without what they take to be the extravagant posturing involving ritual and formulas. Their point is well taken, even if at bottom false. For there is a kind of similarity

between magic in the strict sense and what the Church believes about each of its *seven* Sacraments. Let us consider this in some detail.

The magician claims to be in touch with some awesome preternatural powers. He claims to possess certain mysterious incantations which can trigger the activity of these powers. Real science, of course, now provides stiff competition to the magician. The scientists are content to study just plain *natural* processes; they patiently accumulate knowledge about what influences what — in medicine, chemistry, physics and biology. They then apply this knowledge. They introduce substance X into substance Y, which causes such and such a desired change. There are no prayers or incantations, no preternatural mysteries. The only formulas needed are the ones found in the scientific books.

### *Sacraments transcend nature*

It is far otherwise with the seven sacraments. Although each requires some “matter” and “form”, the effects claimed by each transcend by far any merely natural efficacy. Water, for example, has many natural powers. It is the principle of life; it causes the withered plant to become green again. It washes the soiled and sweating body. It refreshes the tongue, cools the forehead, dissolves food solids—and so much more. But what we claim happens by the waters of Baptism is something else again. A human is spiritually disfigured, estranged from God, spiritually dead, the captive of fallen angels. Then water, plain water, flows over him and a few words are spoken. The human is born again. A divine life pulses through him, his soul is beautiful; the grip of the fallen angel loosens. All this really and truly takes place. Shall we call it magic? No, for it is done through the power of God and not of finite spirits. No again, for the events however real and tremendous, are not ordinarily perceived or experienced in their supernatural reality. They thus rarely excite wonder, as would any magical event. But for those with the faith, what the sacrament effects is far more wondrous than even the most extravagant feat—real or imagined—of magic.

## *God gives the outcome*

The case is similar with the other six sacraments. Spiritual powers are believed to flow from the words of a priest, or the anointing with oil, or the exchange of a few words. Here again, the effects are rarely experienced; here again it is God alone who is credited with the outcome. But what is claimed is so overwhelming and is seemingly "caused" by so slight an external agent that we may forgive our opponents if they persist in calling the Sacraments magic.

Let us take one last example, that of the Holy Eucharist, so as to appreciate the almost outrageous claim made by the Church in her Sacramental teaching. One starts with common natural substances, bread and wine. Then a priest, one who has "received orders" (through words and a slight action!) speaks a few words: and the Eternal Logos is summoned from heaven. Emmanuel—truly God and truly Man—enters the room of sacrifice and is as truly present there in flesh, blood, soul and divinity as is the priest. Who can endure this claim? But it is of the Faith. It was as incredible for the contemporaries of Christ as it is for us today. Hard saying though it is, for them and for us, it is exactly what Catholics are bound to believe.

Two points must now be stressed. First, just because the "effects" are rarely experienced and are thus "invisible", their reality can be grasped only by faith, and this in the degree that the believer has been instructed in true catechesis. An unbeliever will see nothing different after each of the seven sacraments is conferred. Nor will even a believer if he has not learned what exactly it is which the Church teaches concerning each Sacrament. If true teaching is out of a person's mind, then the tremendous effects of any sacrament will be out of his sight.

The second point is to stress that the entire miracle of the sacrament comes through God's will and his power. Through Christ, God has created these mysterious channels. He has sworn to honor those humans who employ the procedures. And thus the Holy Spirit is now bound, in a certain sense, to descend when a bishop, however unworthy, pronounces the formula of confirmation. Emmanuel too may be summoned by any validly ordained priest

—whether to a fitting and reverent Mass or to a shoddy or even blasphemous one. No human could be mad enough to believe that on his own he is able to summon the Holy Spirit or Christ.

Against this background we can now appreciate that the Charismatics seem to be employing an Eighth Sacrament. It is complete with matter and form: with the laying on of hands, and the praying over others. It has ministers, ordinary or extraordinary. Best of all, it is so much like the other seven that this Eighth Sacrament can be *scheduled*: the Spirit will come, e.g., each Monday evening in the Church Hall. Again I insist: deprive the Movement of this expectation, let it be confident about only the regular seven Sacraments, and it will be indistinguishable from third orders and sodalities.

### *They prefer 'regress'*

The notion of progress has played a great role in the present Church crisis. So much has been ejected from the Church because it has been identified with "past ages", with times "before the electric light". So much has been admitted because it seems so new and fresh—and modern. But this fascination with progress is curiously absent in the present apology by charismatics for their Movement. They prefer *regress*. They keep going back to the "birthday of the Church"—to the first Pentecost. What the inspired Scriptures tell us about is uncritically suggested as being applicable to a *second* Pentecost. There is absolutely no scriptural or magisterial authority for such a suggestion. In fact the very opposite seems to have been taught. The Kingdom of God is likened to a mustard seed—tiny, almost invisible. It is destined to become a large tree giving shade and place to many. It is a hidden leaven, but it will make the whole dough rise. The timid Apostles and the gentle Virgin are in a room: all the elements of the Church contained in a single room! But the Spirit descends. This is Christ's Spirit, expressly sent by him. The small Church is created. Signs and wonders abound: the tongues of fire and the gift of tongues. How eminently useful this latter gift is. It enables an Apostle, speaking in his own language, to be understood by many a different national, each in *his*

own tongue. How providential of God to allow his Gospel to be spread so efficiently in those days when it was not possible to have, as we have at the UN today, simultaneous translations of talks.

The community grows, the leaven rises, the sapling grows tall. The Church spreads to distant places. She is the mother of culture and civilization. Much more, she is the mother of saints. Countless thousands cleave to her breasts, drink at the supernatural fountains, abide by her teachings, find in her the otherwise invisible Bridegroom and hear his words through her mouth. Her branches develop from within—organically. They are manifold and strong.

### *Tongues are not Pentecost*

Must *this* Church be born again? Must the tree revert back to the seed, the man to the infant or even to the embryo? Must the script be played out again, with the same details? And, apropos of this, is it even accurate to say that the present "gift of tongues", now found almost ubiquitously in the Charismatic Movement, is similar to the original gift? There the most obvious meaning was that everyone present at that first Pentecost understood; the speaker because he spoke in his own tongue, the others because they heard in their own tongues. Today precisely no one understands. Not the speaker, not the audience. But perhaps an interpreter? Granted that there may be some Scriptural basis for this sense of tongues (mostly in St. Paul's complaint), let us at least admit that it is not the sense stressed in the *first* Pentecost. And let us beware lest our "interpreters" are still more deceived than the rest of us.

### *Members need renewal*

We must be clear about "the need for renewal". It is certain that each of us, sinful members of the Church, always "must go back to the sources"—to Christ and his pure teaching and his adorable and mysterious Being. Only thus can the shriveled tissue be renewed, the ebbing life restored. But this prescription, this need, applies to the members of the Church, not to the Church itself. That first Pentecost saw the Spirit enter the Body. The Body has

grown, the members have differentiated themselves. The doctrines have been organically developed. This Body has in a certain sense made progress. Why then the suggestion that we are now on the threshold of a second Pentecost—as if the Body must be knitted anew, as if the Spirit must in a sense be re-incarnated?

It seems archaic, therefore, to insist, first that the *Church* must start again and, second, that “going back to the sources” means replaying the original script.

I do not believe that spirits are vague things. But the word “spirit” can be quite vague. What any of us means when he uses this word may be hard and even impossible to identify. In general we know that we are in the presence of the spirit of, say, Mother Teresa, when we manage to be near her *body*. The body of any human person serves at the very least to “anchor” his or her spirit, to fix the identity. Perhaps St. Thomas Aquinas was not correct when he said that matter is the principle of individuation. But matter certainly may function as the necessary sign of individuation, at least for us mortals still on pilgrimage. Where my body is, there also—as long as I live on earth—will you find my spirit.

St. Augustine has an important application of the above-stated truth, which concerns the human person. He finds some analogy to the Church and says boldly: “You do not possess the Spirit of Christ unless you possess also the Body of Christ”. Thus, where the *Church* is, there is the Spirit to be found. The Church is the anchor of this Spirit, as also the principle of its identity.

### *What if the Spirit speaks?*

Spirits are very popular in today’s religious world—a strange fact when we consider the almost total triumph of materialism everywhere. But just because it is so difficult to identify any given spirit, a way must be found for the certain discernment of spirits. When Pope John Paul II speaks, or Mother Teresa, or the President of the United States, I may or may not agree with the statements, but I am quite clear as to the origin of each. For I identify the spirit in question by noting the body animated by that spirit.

Now what if the Spirit of God should speak, whether to me or to another mortal? How shall I distinguish it from the spirit of an angel—perhaps even a fallen one? How shall I test spirits? It may seem to me indubitable that right now I am filled with the Holy Spirit, that he instructs and consoles me. But is there not the possibility, even the likelihood, that I am deceived? Have I so surveyed the world of spirits that I may have reasonable certainty about identity? Is it not really presumption or perhaps a form of madness to believe that *God's Spirit*—none other!—has touched me? Am I so sure that I know the real from the counterfeit?

### *The Church must decide*

The standard and correct answer, of course, is that the faithful Catholic must always submit his personal judgment to the legitimate Church authority. This authority alone has the gift, the charism, of a definitive and certain judgment as to whether any teaching or experience is from God. We may be sure that even now Church authorities are closely watching the Charismatic Movement. They may hope that it is indeed the vehicle, if not of a second Pentecost, then of a Second Spring. They may pray that through it the original fervor of the early Church will pulse again through the faithful and enkindle the fires of Divine Charity in all hearts. But these same authorities must simultaneously exercise a patient caution, not to say skepticism, lest the faithful be deceived by the Master of lies. The Church has had experience enough, in her long history, with the Deceiver, garbed so often as an angel of light.

Still, while we await a definitive verdict by the Church, what should the attitude of Catholics be towards the Charismatic Movement? Several Scriptural texts, with somewhat opposite indications, come to mind in answer. One is the famous intervention of Gamaliel when the Pharisees were worried about the Apostles and the increase in their small Christian sect: "If this is man's design or man's undertaking, it will be overthrown; if it is God's, you will have no power to overthrow it" (Acts 5:39). His advice was, therefore, that the Pharisees should let the Apostles alone. In the same direction, some today would urge the same

attitude towards the Charismatic Movement: Let it be. Itself will decide its destiny and its validity. But surely this advice may prove dangerous here? Suppose the Movement is indeed not from God. No doubt it will then fail, as many past movements have done. But will it fail soon? And, before it fails, will it not deceive many and do great spiritual harm to those enthralled by its "experiences"? Do we say of some bodily substance, about to be ingested by large numbers of people: "Let us wait. If it be poison, it will destroy many; but if it be good, it will bring better health"?

### *They do praise the Lord*

On the other hand, the Movement may indeed be from God. It may even now be God's way of preparing a new Springtime for the Church. Would it not then be impertinent (and useless) to raise the swords of our words against this great work of God? And is there not at least one solid proof from Scripture that the Movement is certainly from God? St. Paul himself can be quoted: "Just as no one can be speaking through God's Spirit if he calls Jesus accursed, so it is only through the Holy Spirit that anyone can say, Jesus is the Lord" (1 Cor. 12:3). If we notice how often and with what fervor the present-day charismatics actually do say "Jesus is Lord", it seems that this text of St. Paul puts the question beyond all possible doubt. The charismatics may have their local differences, and may even belong to different Christian denominations, or to none. But they speak in one strong voice with their protestation about the Lordship of Jesus Christ. St. Paul then seems to supply a crucial premise; and the conclusion seems to follow necessarily.

### *Words may be only words*

The conclusion, however, may still be controverted, for the syllogism is not so neat as it appears at first. For what St. Paul obviously means is that no one can *truthfully* say that Jesus is Lord except by the Holy Spirit. Mere talk is cheap. Even as an ambitious French king, a Huguenot, was found to say "Paris is worth a Mass", so anyone can

speak the majestic words, "Jesus is Lord", and then justify any excesses in the name of the Spirit which supposedly is present, infallibly so, since he indeed uttered the words.

This above example, of course, depicts a cynical insincerity. But this is not the only or the chief thing to be feared. Far worse, just because it is somehow not known to the person, is self-deception. A man might really think he means it when he proclaims the Lordship of Christ; but, for all that, his words may be only words after all. Let us explore the possibility further. We may profitably turn to a third Scriptural text, this time from the words of Christ himself. We read in the Gospel of St. Matthew 7:16: "Can grapes be plucked from briers, or figs from thistles? So, indeed, any sound tree will bear good fruit, while any tree that is withered will bear fruit that is worthless; that worthless fruit should come from a sound tree, or good fruit from a withered tree, is impossible . . . I say therefore, it is by their fruit that you will know them".

If I say that Jesus is Lord, I may be expected to *act* as if he truly is. My thoughts, my deeds, my words, my lifestyle ought to be more and more dominated by my zealous embrace of the Lordship of Christ. Many crucial things are implied by the above, each a possible "test" of the genuineness of the Charismatic profession. Speaking in the first person, I ask: Do I hear the Church, the official Church? Do I submit to that extension in time of my proclaimed Lord? Or is the Church some historical accident, some "institution" which forever seeks to smother the fire of the Spirit?

These are questions of supreme importance. Any glorying in the charismatic experience which in any way casts doubt on the divine mission of the Church is an evil fruit: it *cannot* come from *God's* Spirit.

Again, do I go into my room, close the door, and pray in secret—as my proclaimed Lord teaches? Or do I prefer the prayer groups, the meetings, the laying on of hands, the being prayed over? Even more, is my prayer life exclusively social and communal? Unless private prayer is at least as important to me as group prayer, I may well suspect that the Lordship of Jesus is but an emotionally held slogan and not an earnest conviction.

## *Is Mass important?*

Much more important is my attitude towards the mystery of faith, the Blessed Sacrament. Two different tests obtain, each of them decisive. First, is the Mass the great daily action of my life? Or do I find it stuffy and boring, if in fact I attend during the week at all? I may protest that Jesus is Lord, but there are hollow sounds if I prefer the meeting in the basement to the Holy Sacrifice. Those who follow the Charismatic Movement, not as hostile but as friendly critics, would do well to note the correlation between attendance at daily Mass and the attendance at charismatic retreats, missions, healing services and the like. They would do well to ask whether a Movement be of God if its members show no new zeal for the perfect prayer of Christ to the Father and, in fact, if they even come to favor mere prayer meetings over Mass attendance.

Second, there is the awesome question of devotion to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. It would seem to follow that if indeed I acknowledge Jesus to be my Lord, then I would make his sacramental presence the very center of my piety. Far more important than tongues and healings and sharing in the faith-accounts of others would be my silent times alone with Jesus—with *my Lord*! Friendly critics, therefore, should employ this test. Those who are so eager to put the behavioral sciences in the service of the Church may well try to establish a correlation between devotion to the Blessed Sacrament and increased involvement in the Charismatic Movement. Speaking as one informal observer, I note that not only has there been no clamor on the part of local charismatics for exposition of the Blessed Sacrament (even but once a month), but their own deportment during the Consecration and Communion at Mass is generally not too distinguishable from the chatty, informal and casual attitude of those who look upon the Mass as a social gathering of the people of God, and who seem quite oblivious of the *mysterium tremendum* which the Church has always insisted lies at the heart of each Mass.

## *Judgements are difficult*

How beautiful and touching was the role which the Blessed Sacrament played in the conversion and saintly life

of Elizabeth Ann Seton! Do we dare say that her exalted piety and devotion are not necessary today — that the Spirit's manifestations "for our time" is rather to be found in uplifted hands, applause and strange tongues?

The cult of the Blessed Sacrament has almost disappeared from the Western Church, and this at a time when the Charismatic Movement grows more vigorous each year and is put forth as the heart of modern Church renewal. A renewal without the adorable Sacrament? This question must give us great pause.

I fully admit the difficulty of making a judgment on such a concrete and therefore changeable thing as a movement. Some sort of "essence" or "nature" is needed as a fixed identity so that thoughtful analysis and criticism will be possible. In the above I have attempted to sketch certain marks, discernible in the actual Charismatic Movement, which are worrisome when matched against fixed Catholic beliefs and devotions. There are, to be sure, other ways to give some sort of rational perspective to judgment about the Movement. One is historical. Following Ronald Knox, for example, we may study the different outbursts of "enthusiasm" among Christians of past times. We may note certain similarities with the present Movement; and we may suggest that the verdict of history, quite negative about the past enthusiasms and their excesses and bad fruits, must consistently be negative about the present outburst.

But there is still another way to view the present-day charismatic ferment within the Catholic Church. I offer this as my final consideration. Secularization of religion has been a dominant mark of most of the major religions, already during the past hundred years, but above all during the past twenty years. Whether because of the withering "Biblical criticism" which has emptied the Word of God of things supernatural; or because of rationalistic philosophical theories which have invaded the seminaries; or because material affluence has distracted us from the Creator in favor of the glittering forms of creatures: this much is certain. God and eternity and the supernatural have become dimmer and dimmer in the eyes of most humans in our time, even among priests and monks. We live in a spiritual

and religious desert for the most part, just barely able to feed a weakened faith with the stunted grasses that have still survived the secularistic drought. Already twenty-five years ago, the American Bishops noted with alarm the creeping secularism in our lives, both individual and social. We cannot doubt but that Vatican II was called chiefly to discover pastoral means to reverse the spread of the religious deserts. But so far, nothing seems to have been of much help. Nothing, that is, except the Charismatic Movement.

### *Supernatural has been muted*

Can there not be a *natural* explanation for this? Can it not be that the dynamism and enthusiasm of the Movement is due to its being the opposite to the secularistic desert? Even if the Movement were a consciously perpetrated fraud, therefore, with not an atom of divine input, it would still find a "market" for its message. It would be as predictable a success as would the sales of irrigation waters in the Sahara desert. Let us remember that "science" has seemingly conquered more and more of the human terrain. The supernatural has been steadily pushed into ever more confining areas. It has at least been muted, when not totally ignored or ridiculed. Prayer to an unseen God has been downgraded in favor of technology and government programs for health and security. Miracles have been made to seem fantastic and incredible, fit only for the ears and hearts of peasant women. Our lives have been progressively denuded of anything that reminds us of God, and the spiritual and supernatural.

### *It speaks of God again*

But God is real, and we humans are made for God. Against the desert of secularism, therefore, ought we not to expect that the Charismatic Movement will seem like rain from heaven graciously falling upon a parched earth? Who can resist its message, whether from God or the fallen angel or from the fantasies of the mind? It says something different. It speaks of God again and the supernatural. It affirms belief in miracles. It sings of the glory of God to the sullen and listless multitudes, and to the priests and

religious too, for whom religion had become for the most part a barren formality. Thus, even if the Charismatic Movement were itself not supernatural, it yet deals in supernatural things. It offers faith and love and prayer and wonders to the banished children of secular mankind. It preaches, and it seemingly practices, a real contact between God and his creation. Brotherhood, too long entombed by the sands of secularism, seems to emerge again as something desirable and possible. The desert, in short, begins to become green again thanks to the generous and warm rains of the Movement.

The Movement is thus even "naturally" a success just because of the "market" it serves. I must confess, of course, that there remains the possibility—to my mind a very faint one—that it is also a supernatural thing, a rain of grace from God. This of course could be the real explanation for its ready acceptance by so many and for the new fervor which it imparts to a good number of persons, at least for a time. But I think it is far more likely that the natural explanation is true. The Movement comes from the too long frustrated desires of men for the supernatural; it now serves to fill the terrible longing and emptiness of human life. We humans have been piteously deprived; we have known no rest and little refreshment of spirit ever since God was snatched from the world and even ousted or at least dimmed in the churches.

If I am right about this, then it is certain that the Charismatic Movement will not renew the Church. But it is equally certain that the drought, the hunger, the void, the longing are all real. Suppose that we faithful Christians, guided by the Church alone, should rediscover our inheritance. Suppose that our lives and words should reflect the full truth of revelation. Suppose that our preachers should bring the authentic supernatural message of Jesus Christ to the world: about God and Man, sin and redemption. Then, without tongues, without scheduled appearances of the Spirit, without gratuitous claims that we are in a second Pentecost, the green plants will spring up again, more than sufficient to pasture the sheep, listless and weak, and bleating for divine nourishment.

# Parable of a Lost Sheep

REV. JAMES LAPPIN

I HAVE just returned home after a short visit to the Holy Land. While there I went to see an old friend, Abdul Ayoub. Abdul lives in a small village to the east of the road from Jerusalem to Hebron, not far from Hebron itself. After the inevitable strong sweet coffee we walked through the village to the upper end, where we sat on a bench beneath an old olive tree and looked down on the village and the countryside. The hills of Southern Judea are very beautiful in early spring and I thought to myself—its no wonder that the spies sent by Moses went back to him in the desert and said that it was in very deed a land flowing with milk and honey.

Abdul broke in upon my meditation : “I really must tell you about what happened in our village last year. You see that house a little to the east of the main village—there where the track comes up from the wilderness. It is the house of one of our most important shepherds. He is by our standards well-to-do; he must have at least a hundred sheep. Last year he lost one of his sheep. He reported the loss and someone suggested that a pastoral council be set up to consider the matter. It seemed a good idea as we are after all a pastoral people. We do have olive trees and fig trees, we grow some barely and recently also a little wheat; but, by and large, we live with and on our sheep and goats.

“A pastoral council was set up and it was decided that we needed three committees. The first was to inquire into hereditary and genetic factors in wandering sheep; the second was to consider the connection between ecological change and sheep-wandering; and the third was to call in experts and do a study in depth of the feasibility of providing navigational aids for wandering sheep. I assure you my friend that never in my lifetime has there been such activity in our village. We had elections for chairman, appointments of secretaries; we even had in-service training for aged shepherds, but this was not altogether a success.

The young man who gave the course spoke a rather bookish Arabic which we couldn't follow. He was a delightful young man, fresh from College. The reason the course failed was that the shepherds found out that, before he came to our village, his knowledge of sheep was confined to mutton on a plate.

"About this time, one of the Bedouin came in from the wilderness. He came up that track past the shepherd's house. He looked at the sheep in the sheep-fold. 'Are those your sheep?', he said to the shepherd. 'They are', the shepherd replied; 'I mark all my sheep with blue dye on the back of their necks so that I can recognise them anywhere'. 'I saw one of your sheep in the wilderness', said the Bedouin. 'Why did you not bring it in', asked the shepherd. 'What use would that have been', replied the Bedouin, 'it had starved to death; it was dead'.

I said good-bye to Abdul and went up the track to the main road, where I caught the bus back to the little bus station near the Damascus Gate. Next day I travelled down to Lod and got the plane home.

---

### "SO THERE . . . ."

The Cardinals got together, and said,  
"That Papal Throne is a trifle shabby:  
Let's buy him a nice new bench instead".  
The Cardinals said.

So they bought the bench, and they set it where  
He was certain to see it . . . .  
(In fact, he fell over it, and cried  
"!!!!\*\*\*\*\*zzzzwyski!!",  
Which, I understand, is a Polish prayer);

Then he said: "How kind the Cardinals are!  
But I think, you know, I'll have a Chair . . . ."

So there.

S. G.

In this and a subsequent article, written in the form of a letter to a Bishop, Father Crane discusses the work of Claver House of which he is Director and which was founded twenty years ago as a leadership-training centre for overseas students, primarily from Africa.

## CURRENT COMMENT

# Claver House

## 1: THE NEED FOR DEDICATION

### EDITOR

My Lord,

LET me be honest and say I was not all that happy at first to have your letter asking for information about Claver House. Probably you thought, as you have every right to think, that I had to hand a neatly stacked pile of brochures designed to tell the inquirer all about the place. The truth of the matter is that I have no such pile, nor other advertisement material. The reason is twofold. In the first place, this kind of material is so often fraudulent—in this sense, that it rarely paints a true picture. What it represents so often are future hopes, not the reality of the present; what the Director would *like* the place to be, not what it actually is. I have always argued with regard to Claver House that it will stand or fall by what its past students do. If they do a good job on their return home, that is all the advertisement we need. If they don't, then we should not go on advertising ourselves, for we will no longer deserve to exist. In other words, Claver House stands or falls on the record of its students. The record is all it needs by way of advertisement. That and nothing else. Secondly, publicity of the type that is so common nowadays tends to bring the wrong kind of student here; the young fellow, however meritorious in himself, what has his eye primarily on his own future, which is laudable enough, but not what I want. I try to seek out always the

cial ones, as will become clear later on in this letter; use with an eye not to their own future primarily, but out of their country and their Church. These are the ones I am after. The others tend to use their nine months at Lever House as a jumping-off place for further advancement for themselves *alone*. This is not what I want.

### *An Autobiographical Note*

With no bright little brochure to slip in an envelope and add you, I am left with the alternatives of sending you a long letter telling you all about this place or excusing myself with a short note. I choose the former because, at the moment, I have the time and because I can see from your letter that the reason you want the information about Lever House is because you are thinking of sending a student here. That is good. I shall do all I can, therefore, to make things perfectly clear to you. Then you will know what your student is coming to and—very important this—he will be. I want to begin by putting the work of this place—what we are trying to do—in true perspective. This will send me back a bit at first on an autobiographical note. I am sorry about this. I don't like talking about myself in this context but it has to be done.

My interest in what we used to call the "Social Asostole" dates from the thirties. It took me, when I had finished my attempt at studying philosophy and with the consent of my Superiors, to the London School of Economics to do a degree. I felt I ought to do this; I had to know something of production and consumption, manufacture and exchange and the rest of it; the economic side of society, if I was to attempt the application to it of the moral principles governing society as a whole that were encased in Catholic Social teaching. I had to know what *was* before making an attempt to say what *ought* to be in practice. The lesson, I may say so, has not yet been learnt, judging by the number of clerical commentators inclined over-readily to comment on factual economic and social situations of which they appear, to me at least, to know very little. Be that as it may. Four years of theology followed by degree course at L.S.E. Then I joined the Hqrs. Staff of the Catholic Social Guild in Oxford in 1944, at the end of my

theology course and one year after my ordination to the priesthood in 1943.

There followed a very busy time in the service of the Catholic Social Guild from 1944 - 1959. During it, I was taken up with writing and lecturing throughout the United Kingdom, not infrequently in the Republic of Ireland, from time to time overseas—in the United States, the West Indies and some of the mainland countries of Western Europe where, in particular, the Catholic Social Movement was well established, had survived the disruption of the Second World War and was growing in strength. Those were good days. Few realise nowadays how strong the Catholic Social Movement was in so many ways, how much it was growing in strength. It had its defects. On the whole, looking back I would say it was too self-contained, too much, perhaps, of a merry-go-round. There were gaps in its approach which the Young Christian Workers under the great Cardijn, and the Worker Priests, particularly in France, sought to fill. But that is another story.

Two things kept coming at me during my time with the Guild. They were always subconsciously there. There was the feeling that the work we were doing, though good, was somehow incomplete. It lacked a cutting-edge. I shall come back to this. Then, there was the additional, increasingly strong conviction that the countries of what we now call the Third World—that would soon be or now already were independent—would be confronted with the task of *self-development* that would face their governments and people for the first time. Under such circumstances, it would be the duty of the Church, surely, which had so many of her people within these third-world countries, and of the Guild, in the service of the Church, to bring to the people of these emerging countries that knowledge of Catholic Social Teaching on which their development would have to rest, if it was to remain true and, therefore, secure. For lack of that knowledge my own country had gone through the Hell of the Industrial Revolution. Why should these other newly fledged nations be made to endure it? This is the way I was thinking. We were pint-sized, but at least we should try. The effort admittedly was tiny, but it would be in the right direction. We would learn as we

nt. So, our literature went out. I continued to do what could, wishing all the time that I could do more. The rest followed. You know how it is. The literature goes out—books, pamphlets and so on, paid for out of a special fund set up for the purpose. Letters follow and then, in the end, you have to follow the letters yourself. My first trip to Africa was at the end of 1958, more than twenty years ago. I went for ten weeks to what was then Tanganyika, still two or three years away from independence, at the invitation of that country's Hierarchy, endorsed by the Apostolic Delegate to East Africa. That was how my love affair with Africa began. Since then I have been down I do not know how many times to approximately twelve countries of East, Central/Southern and West Africa and the two Indian Ocean States of Mauritius and the Seychelles. There have been visits further afield as well to Pakistan, India, Bangladesh, Singapore, Fiji and the West Indies. I relate this not by way of achievement—it is hardly that—but simply to give you the setting. I have tried to learn as I go along, to listen. I am no expert. I am in the habit of describing myself when asked and, I think, with accuracy, as an tentative tramp; no more.

I made the journeys, of course, because I was able to do so and I was able to do so because, after my first trip to Africa, which finished early in 1959, I was asked by the then General of the White Fathers, the late Father Volker, to take over the direction of a Training Centre, primarily for African students, which he proposed to set up in London. It was to be on a residential basis and to provide short, intensive training courses of nine months for African laymen who would come there with the object of equipping themselves with the knowledge necessary to make a contribution, hopefully of significance, to the public life of their countries on their return home. This was the broad idea. We would learn as we went along. My own General gave his consent, with gratitude to the White Fathers. The respective Provincials agreed. We were away. A year went by whilst we looked for a suitable property. It was found in London's Pimlico at 65, Belgrave Road. The first course began—later than we had intended—on All Saints Day, November 1st, 1960. Since then, we have not looked back. The tide has been rising all the way.

I jumped at the offer, so generously made to myself, for two reasons. In the first place, it enabled me to let my energies loose on a vital third-world continent at a time that was critical, as subsequent events have proved. Secondly, it enabled me to put into practice an idea—better perhaps, work to an ideal—that had long been in my mind and that I felt was incapable of realization within the framework of the Catholic Social Guild as it was when I left it for my African endeavour. The ideal was that of the dedicated individual. My whole confidence was in him and his ability to shift events in the direction demanded by respect for human dignity. As I saw it, what the Guild provided; what it had created in Britain was a climate of opinion in favour of the Catholic Social Ideal whose extent should not be exaggerated, but which was felt undoubtedly in certain areas—Glasgow and Tyneside, for example—and which reached down to men on the factory floor and in the pits. This was a significant achievement of great worth, the fruit of hard, dedicated and often unseen work. What I felt it lacked was the kind of cutting edge, which I saw as its essential complement; the persistent effort of dedicated individuals at key-points in a country's social, political and economic fabric, to influence their everyday, working world in the direction demanded by respect for human dignity. It was this kind of dedicated Christian elite that the time demanded. Its members would be working not as a "subversive", Christian fifth column; but each in his capacity as a responsible Christian citizen. There was nothing subversive about that. Such men are always needed; in this country of mine, more so than ever today. Why, then, should I pitch my effort in Africa? I was often asked that question. The answer I gave was always the same. In the first place, I was given the money to work in Africa—it was raised initially by the White Fathers—and I had to have some money for such a venture. Secondly, the opportunity was greater in Africa for this reason—in many of the countries of that continent a minor push can produce a maximum result: in the older countries of Europe and indeed, in the United States and Canada this is not so. In these the reverse is often the case; a maximum push pro-

ces no more than a minor result, if that. This, mainly the reason that these countries are more bedded down, their peoples more set in their ways than are those of the African Continent and, indeed, many parts of what we call the Third World. Thus the problem before me was partly economic one; that of allotting scarce resources in such way as to obtain the best result. By this test, it was clear that Africa was the place for me. The elite, then, was to be mostly African and, as I saw it then, and still see it now, Claver House, as I called the new Centre after St. Peter Claver, was to be the training ground for its members. Their stamping ground, when their training was done, would be the newly independent countries of Africa. They were to bring to their work when they got back there—and irrespective of what their work might be—that respect for human dignity, which was their ideal and for the realization of which they would work—each in his own way—persistently, patiently and well. This would be on its way when the public life and institutions of any of their respective countries showed the first signs of being so set that they took count, as of primary importance, of the worth of every citizen as a human being, made in the image of God and possessed, in consequence, of the right to make his own way forward in freedom under God, carrying responsibility for his own actions and recognizing always the right of others, like himself, to do the same. A little long-winded, I am afraid, but I think you will see what I was and am still after: it might be described more simply as a social set-up in which men do not exploit each other.

### *Cause for Surprise*

What has surprised me these past twenty years and what continues to surprise me is the way in which this idea and ideal of a dedicated lay elite continues to surprise those who first hear of it. And this for two reasons. I speak, of course, as of everything else in this letter, from personal experience. So many who have made inquiry about Claver House verbally or by letter, have thought that the students were either priests or going on for the priesthood. They have shown surprise bordering on astonishment when I tell them emphatically that the place and the formation

it offers are for young laymen; its object being that of offering them the means of equipping themselves for the task, which is specifically theirs, of permeating the public life of their countries with Christian principles. This task I add, the layman is to carry out not as a delegate of the Catholic Church, but in his individual capacity as a responsible Christian citizen. This, surely, is obvious enough, for the layman who strives to influence the public life of his country in a Christian direction may well have to engage in forms of political and social activity carried very often to a point where his actions would rightly be classed as partisan and, therefore, forbidden to the Church as a whole, which must remain neutral in these matters. Her task, indeed, is to uphold human dignity—to the point, indeed, of open confrontation with the perpetrators of social abuse, and to promote and propagate what we call Catholic Social Teaching; but she is not meant to insert herself within the intricacies of social, political and economic life in such a way and to the point where her official activity in these fields would be classed as definitely partisan. With the layman it is different. He is meant to insert himself within the intricacies of his daily effort to influence his workaday surroundings in a Christian direction. This is what so many priests still do not see. Where a good many of them are still concerned, their idea of the “ideal” layman is often that of an overgrown altar-boy and little more. This no doubt is because they still imagine that what we used to call Catholic Action is confined to good works carried out by the laity, within the field of operation of the Institutional Church, under the direction of the priest. Church activity is still seen too often as lying within diocesan boundaries, presided over by the Bishop, under the direction of his priest-delegates. The outlook seems to persist: so far as I can see, the net effect of the excitement and bustle which took hold of the Church in the wake of the Vatican Council, has been to push the layman into the sacristy and the priest into the marketplace; the exact opposite, I would suggest, of what was originally intended. The clergy have become secularised—going on and on about the Third World, Nuclear Disarmament and the Ecological Problem; whereas the laity have become cleric

sed—seeing the “involvement” demanded of them now—  
as limited to participation in the offertory procession  
the reading on Sundays of an occasional epistle.

### *Need for an Elite Still Unrecognised*

This outlook is tragic. It still persists in one form or another. There is still a failure that is widespread to grasp the idea, still less the ideal, of the dedicated Christian layman working to influence his working environment in the direction demanded by respect for human dignity; giving a positive lead to contemporary society in his capacity, say, as a businessman or worker, plant manager, shop steward, community development officer or county councillor and so on. For such, Catholic Action or the Lay Apostolate or whatever else you want to call it, is not so much an extra added to the layman's daily round of work as an attitude at it, which gets through to others and sets them on the right track. This is what we strive to encourage here at Claver House and this is what still so few recognise as essential. The reason why they think of Claver House students as priests or candidates for the priesthood is that they still think of the priest alone as meant to take the lead in Church activity, which they confine to the organised round of diocesan good works. However excellent such works may be—and many of them are, indeed, excellent—they are not in themselves anything like sufficient in themselves. They need complementing, more than ever today, with the work of a lay elite, striving to permeate society at all its ranges on a basis of Christian principle and in the way outlined above.

### *Leadership Training Centres not in Evidence*

I suppose it is because this need remains largely unrecognised—even after Vatican II with its call for involvement—that so little appears to be done—in this country or overseas—to present laymen with the opportunity of equipping themselves for this task. Maybe this is why—if you asked me to name other centres concentrating on leadership-training with a view to the formation of a lay elite, I would have to reply that I knew of none. You should take this,

of course, with a grain of salt, for my knowledge is limited. I speak only on a basis of personal experience; but I can say quite honestly that, though in my travels I have come across some excellent centres doing a first-class specific job, I have come across none consecrated, as the work of Claret House is consecrated, however inadequately, to the formation of a lay elite. This strikes me as strange, for I would have thought that the build-up of such an elite is more necessary today than ever before. Be that as it may, centres consecrated to this kind of build-up appear to me as conspicuous by their absence. Plenty are engaged in providing the laity with techniques or with a programme of Catechetical Training that is very often largely experimental in nature. But of what use are techniques without dedication? Moreover, the dedicated man will find his own way to the techniques that suit his chosen thrust. I remember a story—I think by Douglas Hyde—of the young dedicated Communist who suffered from a terrible stutter. His dedication was such that he climbed on to a platform of sorts to speak despite it. And his ideal came shining through his stammered sentences. What had been an impediment became a weapon in his hands. Had he gone in for speech therapy and left it at that he would never have turned into the power he later became; instead, his dedication nursed his smouldering zeal into a flame which not only broke through his stuttered sentences, but set the hearts of his hearers aflame.

### *Third-World Catholics and Leadership*

I stress this. I am talking about dedication, insisting that without it, there can be no elite; no positive Christian leadership; no permeation today of contemporary society by Christian principles. May I remind you of that survey which came out a few months ago and which revealed the Catholic Body of this country as strong in its attachment to their Church's doctrinal beliefs, but afflicted strongly by the permissive moral outlook of the present day. The survey was concerned with what could be called the field of personal morality. With regard to that which may be termed public, I would suggest that a survey would reveal a far worse state of affairs; pointing not merely to a

absence of lay leadership, but an absence of knowledge of any real sort concerning the social and moral principles that should govern any country's public life. Maybe we are afraid of the leadership at present demanded of us; or, is it a matter of fear? It could be that we are still unaware of its necessity, content that the Church should continue to shuffle along within the ambit of contemporary secular society and leave it at that. I do not know, though I have my ideas. What I do know, however, is that in those newly independent countries of the Third World where so many young Catholics have had the advantage of what we can call a good academic education, you cannot point to a single government, say, in Africa, of which you could say that it was under the influence of Christian principles. There may be and, indeed, often are Catholics in those governments. They go to Church, are often nice to their priests. Beyond that, however, their Faith does not appear to extend. I do not disparage them for a moment. I do not blame them. The fact is that they have never been taught anything else. So it is that the tone of the public life of their countries, despite the large number of Catholics and other Christians they contain—the fruit of a great deal of hard missionary endeavour—is not distinguished, you might say, for its adherence to Christian principles, which have never been seen by those who taught the present generation of adult African Catholics as meant to be carried into their countries' public life through the later influence of those they taught. Thus, the need for the kind of dedication I have had in mind whilst writing what must now be the first part of this letter to you, My Lord, has not been recognised; nor is it fully recognised as yet. It follows that the motive necessary to stir the young to dedicated action of the sort I have had in mind throughout, has not yet—or only very rarely—been given to them. What that motive should be I shall try to outline in the second half of this letter.

*(To be continued)*

**This Joint Pastoral of the Bishops of Kenya, published last year, is commended to readers as a model of its kind. We believe it will help readers who are looking for firm and clear guidance on matters of supreme importance within the Church today.**

# Family and Responsible Parenthood

BISHOPS OF KENYA

**WE**, your Bishops, are anxious to use this occasion to examine the situation in our country, and to make some practical proposals that would promote the welfare of the children in Kenya. Our aim is to encourage individuals and groups to have a deep and practical concern for the promotion of their good, and we are convinced that loyalty to the teaching of Christ and his Church is the surest and most effective means of fostering this great work. We feel it our duty to God and to our people, therefore, to try to promote Christian values that are sometimes ignored, and oppose ideas and trends that are contrary to the teaching of the Gospel and hence to the welfare of our people.

In promoting the welfare of children there are many elements in our traditions that can be of great assistance to us. These are part of our cultural heritage, that should not be lost. For our people, children are seen as a gift from God. They are a sign of God's blessing, a blessing that is received with gratitude and treasured with love. They are a joy to their parents and a welcome gift to the community in which they are born. Even from an early age they are integrated into the life of the community, and assume roles in accordance with their sex, age and ability.

This attitude of the past is in accordance with the teaching of the Gospel where Christ said : "Let the little children come to me..." (Mt 19:14). We recommend that these traditional values be maintained and treasured, and that they be passed on to future generations. We find these

values contrast sharply with some recent trends and ideologies that have gained favour in many parts of the world, and are becoming more and more prevalent among our own people.

The character of a society can be judged by its attitude to its children. If we uphold and develop the traditions we have inherited, traditions vindicated by the teaching of Christ, then we lay a solid foundation for future generations and for the true development of our people.

## FAMILY

We cannot be serious about promoting the interests and the rights of children unless we are fully committed to promoting the interests of the family. It is impossible to promote the good of children without promoting the good of the family. Already the Bishops of East Africa, and the representatives from Episcopal Conferences of all Africa, have stressed the importance of this subject, and it is not our intention here to cover the same ground again. What is aimed at is to review some of the areas of major importance in our society, and to make some practical suggestions. It is for individuals, for families, and for communities to adopt some practical and concrete means to help in the building up of strong united families. In this way the children will be provided with the atmosphere and the facilities they need for their growth and development.

**a) Socio-economic factors :** A family is not an isolated unit in society; it is part of a larger unit. The general health of the larger society affects the family. It is encouraging to find in Kenya that there has been such wonderful progress in the socio-economic development of the country, in an atmosphere of peace, brotherliness and political maturity. The peace and stability that we experience is a major asset to the well-being of families. Efforts must be intensified to maintain peace and prosperity, and to ensure that the development of the country is in the interests of all.

**(b Employment :** Employment is necessary so that a family is self-sufficient, and can maintain its dignity and self-respect. It is specially important that the bread-winner of the family be able to get suitable employment near home. In particular, it is highly desirable that rural workers, and especially those in the agricultural sector get just wages, so

that the men folk are not obliged to go to the towns and cities in search of employment. This often causes the family to break up. For rural families, it is highly desirable that they own some land. Thus the just distribution of land is a major social concern. The consequences of carrying out a proper programme here could be of very considerable benefit to the families of today, and ensure the stability and progress of the community of the future.

**c) Absentee Fathers :** The growing tendency for the father of the family to be absent from the home most of the year should be looked on as a social evil that needs to be corrected. No economic planning that promotes such a system can be in the real interests of the people.

**d) Housing :** Families living in towns are often under severe strain because of the lack of housing, or the conditions of the housing. It is obviously not easy to provide sufficient and suitable housing for all who are now flocking to the towns. However, every effort should be made to try to accommodate families properly. They should not be at the mercy of unscrupulous landlords who charge exorbitant rents, and evict at will. The high rents and the difficulties families find in acquiring their own houses are the cause of a lot of suffering and conflict in families.

**e) Working Mothers :** It is often regarded as the norm in our present day society, that both father and mother be employed outside the home. Such an attitude needs to be carefully reconsidered. It should be understood that the most important work a mother has to do is to provide for the proper rearing and upbringing of her children. A woman who is devoted to her home and her family is, in fact, working in a very real sense and making a very real contribution to the development of the country. Let it not be thought that the process of nation-building takes place only outside the home. The woman who gives her time and talents to her home and family is not depriving her family by not earning a salary. On the contrary, she is making a very significant contribution to her children in a way that no money can supply.

When both parents are working away from home, the children are often left in the care of other children. This is a twofold injustice : it is unfair to those in charge and to

those who have to be tended. Even when competent persons are entrusted with the care of children, they are not an adequate substitute for the parents. The structure of employment in our towns in particular needs to be reconsidered, so that the children get the care they need. The thinking here should be towards providing the fathers of families with wages sufficient to support the family, so that it is not necessary for the mother to be a wage earner too. Perhaps, as an intermediate measure, the part-time employment of mothers of families ought to be considered and promoted.

**f) Alcoholism :** The problem of excessive drinking and of alcoholism has reached almost epidemic proportions in some sections of our society. Its effects on the family are usually of a very serious nature, and the vast propaganda that encourages the sale of alcohol is really propaganda against the family. Moves to curtail the distribution and sale of alcohol are welcome, but a lot more needs to be done.

Excessive use of alcohol is often a symptom of a deeper evil. It is an escape from the obligations of the family : it can be a protest against the conditions of work, or against the conditions of the home. It can be an indication of the lack of social and leisure amenities in a community. More often it is a result of conflict within the family circle rather than a cause of conflict. Therefore, what is of vital importance here is for everyone to be aware of the evil, the very grave evil, of the abuse of alcohol in our society, and for all to be concerned with correcting it. To promote good communications within the family is often the most effective means of reducing the problem. It is strongly recommended that Church communities throughout the country get involved in promoting more and more the good of the families, by organising workshops, seminars, retreats, and such like, to build up family relationships and bring happiness to the home. It is heartening to see that such work has already begun in some places. This should be encouraged and further developed.

At the same time it is the concern of the whole community, and of public authorities in particular, to do everything possible to alleviate the evil brought about by the abuse of

alcohol. The Church is willing to support efforts made in this regard.

**g) Single-Parent Families :** The basic need of any child is a family where both parents cooperate harmoniously in its upbringing. Both parents have the right and the duty to devote themselves to the rearing and the education of the children they are responsible for bringing into the world. Where either parent neglects this duty, a serious wrong is done to the other parent and the child. The tendency for girls to have children outside marriage is, therefore, one that should be opposed by all. It is not in the interests of the unmarried mothers themselves, and the consequences for the children are very serious. It is true that motherhood has a value; but this is within the context of the family. It is not enough that the mother provides food, shelter and education for her child; the child needs also the care of a father and, if this is missing, the child always suffers. In addition to this it must, of course, be clearly understood that the act of intercourse outside marriage is gravely sinful.

## RESPONSIBLE PARENTHOOD

What has been said so far indicates the concern of the Bishops, and the whole Church in Kenya, for the welfare of the families of this country. The Catholic Church is totally committed to promoting whatever will lead to the good of the people and communities here. Now an important issue has to be dealt with, the question of Responsible Parenthood.

The teaching of the Catholic Church was outlined in 1968 by the late Pope Paul VI in the Encyclical "*Humanae Vitae*". On this point there is no hesitation. The developments of the past ten years have helped to strengthen the conviction of many people regarding the position of the Pope. There is therefore no change in the doctrine as outlined by Pope Paul VI. It is unfortunate that this teaching has not been widely understood. And here there is a lot of work to be done, for unless the Church's teaching is understood and accepted, there is a lot of doubt and confusion. The teaching of the Church is very necessary for

our people, so that they may be guided in what is the right path for them to follow.

Obviously it is a good thing that couples and communities should have a responsible attitude towards the bringing of children into the world, and rearing and educating these children once they are born. But not every method that assists in the control of fertility is acceptable; and in our own society today many solutions are being proposed that are unacceptable to the Church. It is not in the interest of couples, nor in the interest of our society, to promote these methods, though this is being widely done.

## ABORTION

The most radical method of birth prevention, and one which deserves the most serious and forthright condemnation, is the termination of pregnancy by abortion. Whatever the terms used and whatever the motivation proposed, abortion is the killing of unborn human beings. The Church, and society at large, must insist on the right of all humans to life. This is the most fundamental human right, and it applies to all humans equally, even those who are not yet born. Direct abortion is direct killing, and this may never be tolerated. The damage caused to the mother is of a very serious nature, and this should not be underestimated. It is important for our people not to be led astray by false theories about abortion. They should be brought to realise that from the time of conception one is dealing with human life, and this may not be destroyed. That the woman has control over the child conceived in her womb in such a way that she can decide to have it destroyed is totally false.

## STERILISATION

*Direct sterilisation* of the man or woman, whether temporary or permanent, is not a lawful method of birth control or prevention. By *direct* sterilisation we mean every sterilisation which of itself, that is, of its own nature and condition, has immediately the sole effect of rendering a person infertile, so that children cannot be conceived. This is an unwarranted interference with the integrity of the human person, is always immoral and absolutely forbidden, notwithstanding any subjectively right intention or any other reason.

*Indirect sterilisation*, on the other hand, may sometimes be lawful. In this case the sterilisation, although foreseen, is not caused with the direct intention of making conception impossible, but in order to cure a disease that may be present in a particular organ of the body. For instance a cancerous womb may be removed to protect the life of a woman, although it is foreseen that the operation will certainly make it impossible for her to bear children. Those responsible for the teaching of religion and morality should be conversant with the teaching of the Church in this regard, and be prepared to give assistance to medical practitioners and to all who are interested.

## CONTRACEPTIVES

The use of artificial contraceptives is immoral. The teaching of the Church in this regard is clear, and our people should be taught the meaning and the consequences of this teaching. This is not an unthinking restriction on the findings of modern science. It is a positive protection of the dignity of the person, and of the couple joined in a bond of love in marriage.

The use of contraceptives in no way enhances the freedom and the dignity of the woman; quite the contrary. Such use does not improve the quality of the marital relationship. There is evidence from societies where the use of contraceptives is widespread, that the rate of marriage breakdown is reaching alarming proportions. What will be the effects of the widespread use of contraceptives on the generations now growing up? The indications are that they will be very serious indeed. However, as in the case of sterilisation, so here too, it is lawful to use medicine to cure some illnesses even though this medicine may have an indirect contraceptive effect.

Some contraceptive devices being used, in reality lead to abortion, that is, they produce an abortion. This is the effect of most of the Intrauterine Devices (I.U.D's), and also of some of the pills and injections that are given. Also, some drugs used have very serious side-effects, and so are banned in many countries.

Medical science is more and more alarmed at the side-effects of many of the contraceptives in use today. But

other disciplines likewise are beginning to show concern at the effects on society, on individuals, and especially on the young, of the interference with the normal processes of the human body. In Kenya we have the United Nations Secretariat for the Environment—the body that is interested in the preservation of the natural habitat.

It would be ironic if more attention were given to the natural habitat of man than to his natural physiology and psychology which need to be preserved and not tampered with.

## POSITIVE PROPOSALS: OUR PASTORAL CONCERN

a) *The Church in Kenya*, as everywhere is committed to fidelity to the teaching of Christ—to Tradition and to the Magisterium (teaching authority). It knows that such fidelity is in the interests of the people of our country. It does not consider the people of Kenya incapable of responding to the demands of the Christian-Catholic doctrine. We, your Bishops, would do a disservice to the people if we did not expect of them the goodness and fidelity that they are capable of by the grace of God.

We, shepherds of your souls, are aware of the problems of the people, and are vitally interested in their solution. In the past, as is generally recognised, the Church has played a major part in the development of education and medicine in the country. Always with deep respect for the dignity of the human person, the Church will continue to develop medical services so that these do not become a kind of inhuman administration of drugs or mechanical application of remedies, but rather the expression of genuine care, for the true well-being of our people in their distress and suffering.

b) *Lawful methods of Responsible Parenthood*: In the area of Responsible Parenthood, there is need for education and medical care. Pope Paul VI called for the development of methods that could be used by parents, so that they could plan their families in a mature and responsible way, without prejudice to their natures, or to the nature of their families. There has been very considerable progress in this field during the last ten years. And now, with confidence,

people are proposing methods that are reliable, safe, readily available, and morally and culturally acceptable to our people. It is hoped that these methods will become better known and more widely used in future. In recent years the Church has encouraged the adoption of methods of Natural Family Planning, and already a number of initiatives have been taken. Now with the experience gained, a more intensive and more effective programme can be undertaken for the benefit of our people.

These methods require that husband and wife enter into a special relationship with each other, that they cooperate and communicate freely, and come to joint decisions. So, their mutual love and understanding is greatly strengthened, and their married life takes on a new and deeper meaning because it comes to be based on a relationship that is in harmony with their human personality and with the nature of marriage as God wishes it to be.

These natural methods of family planning require careful and competent teaching, and it is important that those who wish to instruct others in their use should be well trained in them, and clear in the way they present them. Here lies a fruitful apostolate for many of our married people. By learning these methods and teaching them to others they can provide a wonderful service to their fellow men. As Pope Paul VI wrote : "Among the fruits which ripen forth from a generous effort of fidelity to the Divine Law, one of the most precious is that married couples themselves frequently feel the desire to communicate their experience to others. . ." It is married couples themselves who become apostles and guides to other married couples. This is surely among so many forms of apostolate, one which seems so opportune today.

c) *Programme of the Kenya Episcopal Conference.* For some years the Church has been active in promoting the education of parents in the use of the Natural Method of Family Planning. The Kenya Episcopal Conference now plans to implement, through the Kenya Catholic Secretariat, a nation-wide programme which will encourage and support Christian Family Life.

This programme will seek to promote a better understanding of the meaning of human life, the dignity of the

person, and the sacredness of Christian marriage. One component of this will be training in child-spacing according to the Natural Method of Family Planning.

In this programme, the K.C.S. will collaborate with the Family Life Counselling Association of Kenya (FLCAK), a voluntary organization, formed in 1977, devoted to promoting family life and spreading information on Natural Family Planning.

A training programme is being worked out for teachers of Natural Family Planning in Kenya. It is hoped that many couples will cooperate in this programme.

## MEDICAL ETHICS IN CATHOLIC HOSPITALS

In line with what has been said, it is important that Catholic hospitals, clinics and dispensaries give practical as well as theoretical witness to the sanctity of human life, both at its beginning in conception, and at every stage in its existence. As institutions dedicated to this ideal, they cannot, without being false to the principles for which they stand, be associated in any way with practices or programmes they believe to be wrong.

For this reason they should do everything they can to have on their staff, doctors, nurses, and health-care workers who are committed to these principles and are opposed to abortion, sterilisation, and the various contraceptive procedures that are condemned by the Church. They should also make their policies known to all patients and to those who attend these patients in the hospitals. In this way they uphold God's plan and exercise a very important pastoral mission in the world today.

Catholic medical personnel in *non-Catholic institutions* may sometimes be faced with problems of conscience in these matters, e.g. if they are asked to cooperate in providing services or treatments that they believe to be wrong. It is important, therefore, that they be as well informed as possible so that they will be able to make a responsible judgment. While the circumstances in individual cases may vary considerably, the following general principles should be kept in mind.

Any cooperation with others in an immoral action that is accompanied by personal approval of the decision to

perform such an action is always sinful, since it involves a deliberate identification of oneself with the sinful intention.

The same is true even when one does not approve of the decision, but agrees to cooperate *immediately and directly* in the evil action itself. For instance, one may disagree with another's decision to procure an abortion. But if, in spite of this, one helps directly in the action that causes the abortion, one commits the same sin as if one approved. Provided one does not agree with the evil intention, and does not help *directly* in an action that is intrinsically evil, there are times when cooperation is lawful. These occur when the following three conditions are simultaneously verified :

a) When the act by which one cooperates is good in itself, or at least morally indifferent, e.g. the preliminary preparation of a theatre for an immoral operation, the preparation and aftercare of the patient, etc.

b) When there is a sufficiently grave reason for cooperating in a particular case. For medical personnel this means that the more immoral an operation or a particular form of treatment is, and the more essential one's help is in undertaking it, the more serious one's reason must be for cooperating in it.

c) When every effort is made to avoid the danger of giving scandal or bad example to others, e.g. by explaining the circumstances which make one's cooperation lawful.

In coming to a decision as to whether cooperation is lawful or not in their circumstances, Catholic medical personnel should give careful consideration to these general principles and be guided by them. Where they find it difficult to apply them to a particular case, they should consult the local Pastor or Chaplain for his advice, and try to reach a balanced judgment in the light of all the factors involved.

Sometimes this judgment may indicate that cooperation would not be lawful. In these cases, while Catholic medical workers should refrain from judging the motives of their colleagues or patients who do not agree with them, they should make their conscientious objections clearly known and refuse to participate. This may be very difficult at times, as they may be condemned or unfairly treated for

their stand. But the Gospels leave no doubt that a courageous witness to their convictions is the right course to follow: "Blessed are those who suffer persecution for justice' sake, for theirs is the Kingdom of Heaven" (Mt 5:10). Where undue pressures are brought to bear on them—like threats of dismissal or loss of privileges etc.—they should have recourse to the Church authorities in their area, who will do all in their power to protect and support them.

## CONCLUSION

The late founder of our Nation, Mzee Jomo Kenyatta, told the Bishops of Eastern Africa (AMECEA) in July 1976: "The Church is the conscience of society, and today a society needs a conscience. Do not be afraid to speak. If we go wrong and you keep quiet, one day you may have to answer for our mistakes". It is the duty of Catholics to witness to their convictions, otherwise they will not be loyal to the Church as the conscience of society.

We, the shepherds of your souls, wish to remind you that the Christian Religion is supernatural. To be faithful to it we need Divine Help. "Without me", Christ said, "you can do nothing" (John 15:5). It is by our own personal effort and by prayer through Christ our Saviour, that God gives us the grace we need to have faith in him, and to be obedient to his commands. Therefore, let us pray with humility, that all families, following the example of the Holy Family of Nazareth, where Jesus grew in grace and wisdom before God and man, may be guided by the same Spirit, and help to make our Kenya pleasing to God and to all men.

We bless you, and remain,

Yours devotedly in Christ

Maurice Cardinal Otunga,  
Archbishop of Nairobi

and

The Catholic Bishops of Kenya.

# Book Reviews

## SHORTS

Necessity rather than choice compels compression to the space of a few lines of the comment called for by booklets and pamphlets that have come recently into my hands.

*Abortion and the Right to Live* (C.T.S. 25p) appeared on January 24th of this year under the signatures of the two Cardinals and five Archbishops of England, Scotland and Wales. It is well written, clear and definite. The tone is temperate, which is good; but a little too deferential to public opinion. Abortion is not wrong because the Church says it is. The Church condemns abortion because it is against God's law that governs human beings by reason of their human nature, irrespective, therefore, as to whether they are Catholics or not. In condemning abortion, then, the Church is not *imposing* its teaching on non-Catholic citizens of the United Kingdom. It is reminding them of God's law in their regard as human beings. The Church has nothing to apologise for in upholding that law. This, I think, could have been brought out a good deal more strongly in this pamphlet. Additionally, social abuse in the shape, for example, of grossly confined living accommodation should have been highlighted as driving young couples — very often unwillingly — into the abortionist's hands. Much greater emphasis could and should have been laid on this point. It is easy enough to judge abortion outrageous from a theoretical angle. The judgment will take added strength when those who make it give evidence that they, in fact, really understand the plight of a young couple, with one room to live in and a landlady who makes it clear that, if a child comes, they must get out. What precisely are they to do in this situation? It is easy to give a theoretical answer; agonisingly hard to put it into practice. Evidence that this is fully realised would give added strength to the excellent case against abortion made by the Bishops in their pamphlet.

Pat North's, *A Difficulty for Many* deals with contraception firmly and sympathetically in question-and-answer

form. Highly recommended, along with, *What's the Difference?*, a Lamp Society leaflet. 30p buys Pat North's booklet of 32 pages or 10 copies of their leaflet. I would recommend both—post-free from the Secretary, The Lamp Society, 21 Elm Road North, Prenton, Birkenhead, Merseyside L42 9BB. Valuable, I think, for the contraception/abortion controversy is a booklet of approximately forty-eight pages recently issued by Sun Life, Greystone, Thaxton, Virginia 24174, U.S.A. It is entitled *The Position of Modern Science on the Beginning of Human Life*. This provides valuable supporting material for those engaged in the abortion controversy, which will be with us for a long time. It gives the answer to a lot of supplementary questions surrounding this controversy and supports the answer it gives with a weight of sound, balanced and expert scientific opinion. No price for the booklet is given. It could be free. It is obtainable from the address given above.

Frank Sheed in his old age is still a master, as he shows in a recent C.T.S. pamphlet entitled *God? Of Course* (25p). The title makes it seem all too easy; and it isn't. That is why the title is a poor one. Moreover, the old master should have been allowed more space. Then he could have made a real job of his subject. What we get in this pamphlet, therefore, is not much more than a glimpse of his perceptive insights on this vast question. This is a great pity. It is not Frank Sheed's fault, but that of his publishers. They should have allowed him a lot more rope. The CTS should think now about a booklet on this all-important subject—by Sheed. It would be enormously helpful to many. It would sell very well.

The Augustine Publishing Company (Chawleigh, Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL, U.K.) has done very well to give us Francis Johnston's comprehensive, *Fatima: The Great Sign* for the reasonable price of £1.70 in the United Kingdom and \$3.50 in the United States. I would say that this is cheap for a book of approximately 150 pages in an attractive soft cover. Cheaper still when one realises that the writer is not indulging in a pious exercise, but presenting a fact of the utmost significance for our day and age. Incidentally, for those who would like a brief and most excel-

lent introduction to the Fatima story, there is still available from the Catholic Truth Society, London another printing of the late Father Martindale's, *What Happened at Fatima* (15p). It is the best short thing there is on this subject.

Professor James Hitchcock's recently published booklet, *On the Present Position of Catholics in America* will interest those readers who have read my three articles that came out of a double reading of Hitchcock's most perceptive book, *Catholicism and Modernity*. The booklet will serve as a valuable introduction to the book. Those who have the time and the money should not let it serve as a replacement for it. For those who have to content themselves with the booklet, the price in the United States is \$2.00. The price in this country—from St. Duthac's Book Service, 39, Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon, Surrey would be approximately £1.

And finally, Father Joseph Brown, whose poems have been so much appreciated by readers of *Christian Order*, has published at £1.50 what he calls a final volume of his poetry. Titled *At the End of the Day*, it is obtainable from the Author at Abbey Mead, Hall Lane, Lydiate, Liverpool.

—Paul Crane, S.J.

---

## PREPARATION FOR THE FIGHT WITH THE PRINCE OF DARKNESS

Lord,  
Don't weigh me down  
(As Saul did David)  
So my knees buckle  
Under the weight of your mail;  
Give me five smooth stones  
And a good eye.

—Frank Rickards

**BRITON'S CATHOLIC LIBRARY**

Presents

**The Lives of The Fathers,  
Martyrs and other Principal  
Saints**

by

**Reverend Alban Butler**

Due to the virtual disappearance of the original *Lives of the Saints* by Alban Butler, Briton's Catholic Library intends to republish the old masterpiece in a beautifully hardbound two-volume set, containing 64 traditional illustrations in a total of 2024 pages. The unsurpassing quality of the original over later editions is at once manifest and remarkable. This treasure of Catholic doctrine, morals, liturgy, history and piety will be republished if enough interest is shown by prospective buyers.

The price will be £25.00 (U.S., Canada and  
Australia: \$50.00).

Readers and potential buyers are urged to write  
us and express their interest:

**44 BLOOMSBURY SQUARE,  
LONDON WC1A 2RA**

# THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY

FOR THE PRESERVATION OF  
THE TRIDENTINE RITE



If you are a reader of  
CHRISTIAN ORDER  
you should join  
THE LATIN MASS  
SOCIETY.

The Latin Mass Society  
upholds the Latin immemorial Mass  
under a Papal Indult.

----- Detach here -----  
Please send me further information about THE LATIN  
MASS SOCIETY

NAME .....

ADDRESS.....

.....

## THE LATIN MASS SOCIETY

43 BLANDFORD STREET, LONDON W1.

Telephone 01-935 0303 Registered Charity No. 248388